THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 31st July 1952.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, Madras, at half past eight of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Irrigation Schemes included in the Five-year Plan.

* 293-K Q.—SRI G. LATCHANNA : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) how many Irrigation Schemes, the Government have recommended to the Government of India in the supplementary list to be included in the Five-year Plan ;

(*b*) whether the Vamsadhara Project Scheme has been included in that list ;

(*c*) what is the basis that has been adopted in making their recommendation ; and

(*d*) whether all the necessary investigations are completed in respect of those Irrigation Schemes which have been recommended to the Government of India?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" (*a*) Eleven.

" (*b*) No.

" (*c*) The following bases laid down by the Planning Commission were adopted by this Government in making the recommendations :—

(1) Projects for inclusion in the Plan should have been investigated in sufficient detail from the technical, economic and financial points of view ;

(2) Projects which will add to the food production of the country should receive priority over projects relating to other uses of waters ;

(3) Projects which are most remunerative—in terms of cost of irrigation per acre—and those which would yield results within a short time should be given preference ; and

(4) Region-wise requirements of food and power should receive due consideration, as also the needs of the backward areas.

" (*d*) Yes, to the extent needed for the purpose."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" May I know whether the considerations mentioned by the Hon. Minister do not apply to the proposed Vamsadhara Scheme? "

[31st July 1952

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" The Vamsadhara Scheme has not been investigated in detail and, therefore, these considerations do not apply to it at present."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" Have all the other schemes recommended by the Government of Madras been investigated completely? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" The answer to this question has already been given in clause (*d*), namely, ' Yes, to the extent needed for the purpose '."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" May I know the names of the irrigation schemes that have been recommended to be included in the supplementary list of the Five-year Plan? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" They are the Krishna-Pennar Project, the Vaigai Reservoir Scheme, the Gandikota Scheme, the Amaravathi Scheme, the Kannarajapuja Scheme, Sattam Project, the Budameru Reservoir Scheme, the Krishnagiri Reservoir Scheme, certain Grow More Food and minor irrigation projects, the Ramapadasagar Project and the Tungabhadra High Level Canal."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" May I know whether the Vamsadhara Project has been investigated from the technical, economic and financial points of view and what the aspects which remain uninvestigated with regard to this Project are? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" The Project has not been investigated in detail from any point of view. Only the preliminary investigation is going on. Three sites have been selected for the location of a dam and the final selection has not yet been made. It was expected to be made by the end of July 1952."

SRI S. JAYARAMA REDDIYAR :—" As many hon. Members are putting questions to elicit information as to whether a particular scheme has been included in the Five-year Plan or in the Post-war Development Plan, will the Government be pleased to supply the hon. Members with a copy of the schemes that have been included either in the Five-year Plan or in the Post-war Development Plan, in respect of all the departments? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" It will be considered."

SRI L. LAKSHMANA DAS :—" Is it a fact that the investigation of the Vamsadhara Project has been stopped? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" No; Sir."

SRI V. P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—" Has the Nandivada Project for Nagavalli been included in the minor irrigation projects? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" I am sorry I cannot give that information now because a number of minor irrigation projects which were under execution have been included."

31st July 1952]

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ అయ్యా, ఇంతకు ముందు జనరల్ డిస్కషన్‌లో ప్రధానమంత్రిగారు క్రిష్ణా-పెన్నారు ప్రాజెక్టు విషయంలో ప్రభుత్వము ఏమి చేయలేదని, దానిపైన రిపోర్టు వచ్చిన తరువాతనే ఆలోచిస్తామని చెప్పారు. అయితే ఇప్పుడు మంత్రిగారు దీనిని ప్రణాళికలో చేర్చినారని అంటున్నారు. ఈ విధంగా చెప్పడం ప్రధానమంత్రి చేసిన వాగ్దానానికి విరుద్ధము గాదా ?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ దీనిని ప్రణాళికలో చేర్చ లేదండి. సప్లిమెంటరీ ప్లానులో చేర్చమని సిఫార్సు మాత్రమే రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వము చేసియున్నది.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ In view of the fact that the cost of the schemes recommended to be included in the supplementary plan is of the order of Rs. 300 crores or Rs. 320 crores and in view of the fact that the Central Government promised to allot only about Rs. 50 crores for the supplementary Five-year Plan, will the Government take the Members of the Opposition also into their confidence, have a representative committee to go into the details of the various schemes, and then make a revised recommendation to the Planning Commission? ”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ The Madras Government have already recommended eleven schemes for inclusion in the supplementary plan. After the report is received from the Central Government as to what schemes have been included in the supplementary plan, the question raised by the Leader of the Opposition may be considered.”

Stationing of Special Armed Police at Jaggayyapet.

* 294 Q.—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU : Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether any of the Special Armed Police are stationed at Jaggayyapet; and

(*b*) if so, how many?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ (*a*) & (*b*) It will defeat the purpose of security measures which the Government feel to be necessary if contemporaneously such information as is asked for is given.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ The reply was that it will defeat the very purpose for which these forces are intended, I know definitely that these forces are stationed there and they are harassing the people there. In view of the fact that even in Hyderabad there is an elected Government in power, may I know for what purpose and how many of them have been stationed in that area? ” 8.40 a.m.

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, the general purpose is to keep the anti-social elements there under control and for providing bandobust in the border and other villages where trouble is apprehended. I cannot give the details asked for. If I tell here that so many of them are stationed there, then they will be overpowered.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—" It has become the practice of the Hon. Chief Minister to refer to the so-called ' anti-social elements '. May I know whether the Hon. Chief Minister thinks that those elements are found only in certain areas of this State and can be curbed only by special armed forces? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" It is not only by police forces that we can keep them under control. There are a number of other things to be done. But Police forces are also necessary."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" May I know what the Hon. Chief Minister means by ' anti-social elements '? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Anti-social elements are those who are inclined whenever there is an advantageous position or context to subvert order and law."

SRI P. RAMA RAO :—" May I know whether there was any request from the people of that area that these forces may be stationed there? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Our interest is not only in the local people but the whole State."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" May I know whether the Hon. Chief Minister is aware of the fact that these forces are supporting the anti-social elements like zamindars and big landlords in those parts? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" They are likely to support and there is danger if temptations are offered by anybody in any side."

Extent of land handed over to the political sufferers.

* 295 Q.—SRI M. RAJESWARA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the total extent of land handed over by the Government to the political sufferers up to date;

(b) the extent of such land taken away from the possession of the Harijans and other landless poor and granted to such political sufferers up to date;

(c) the extent of land handed back to the Government by the political sufferers; and

(d) the extent of such land, if any, granted to the landless poor during the same period?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" (a) to (d) Government are collecting information and it is not complete yet."

SRI M. RAJESWARA RAO :—" In view of the statement made by the Hon. Education Minister on the floor of the House that the Harijan sivoijamadars will be given preference over even political sufferers in the matter of assignment of lands, will the

31st July 1952]

Government call for information from the District Collectors and also issue a press communique to that effect for the information of the public?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"It is a complex question, but I can only give a simple answer. I shall see what is it all about."

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—"In view of the fact that the landless poor people are put to great difficulties, may I know whether the Government will issue orders to the effect that these people are not disturbed by the political sufferers?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"I cannot issue orders, but I do sympathise as much as the other hon. Member. Wherever it is legal and feasible, it will be looked into."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—"In view of the fact that about 80 persons—Harijans and other poor people—have been arrested in Bapatla taluk, will the Government give us an assurance that in the matter of giving lands to the landless people, they will help these Harijans and other poor landless people and not the political sufferers?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"The hon. Member need not advise me on that. We are already on it."

Admission to medical colleges.

* 296 *Q.*—SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have appointed any Committee for medical colleges to select students for admission;

(*b*) if the answer for the above is in the affirmative, whether the Government have issued detailed instructions to the Committee to be followed in the method of selecting students;

(*c*) whether the Government have changed or modified the instructions in force last year;

(*d*) if so, what are the reasons for the same; and

(*e*) whether the Government have issued any percentage of seats for girl students belonging to the backward and scheduled classes within the 20 per cent issued for girls in the Medical Colleges?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—"(*a*) The answer is in the affirmative.

"(*b*) The rules and orders of Government embodying certain principles in the matter of selection of candidates have been made available to the Committee.

"(*c*) & (*d*) The reservation of seats for discretionary allotment by Government has been discontinued this year. Except for this, admissions to the medical colleges will be on the same lines as in 1951–52.

[31st July 1952

" (e) Twenty per cent of the number of seats available including those reserved for scheduled castes and tribes and backward classes shall be reserved for women irrespective of the communities to which they belong. This reservation will be kept in view by the Committee in making selections to the seats reserved for the scheduled castes and tribes and the backward classes."

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—" In view of the answer given to sub-clause (e) of the main question, and in view of the fact that the girl students belonging to backward communities and scheduled castes cannot be expected to compete with those coming from other communities, will the Government consider the necessity for reserving some seats for girl students coming from backward communities and scheduled castes? "

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—" Among the girl students selected, there are girls belonging to backward communities also."

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—" Are there any members in the Selection Committee, who belong to the Harijan and backward communities? If not, will the Government consider the advisability of including members coming from these communities also in the Selection Committee? "

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—" There is no communal representation in regard to the members of the Committee. People who are considered best qualified for selecting candidates are selected."

SRI K. ARANGANATHAN :—" May I know whether it is a fact that last year out of a total of 500 marks allotted to non-Brahman candidates, 250 marks were allotted for examination and the other 250 marks for extra-curricular activities, while this year 200 marks out of a total of 250 have been set apart for examination results and only 50 marks for extra-curricular activities? If it is a fact, will it not defeat the very purpose of their scheme to give fair representation to the backward community students? Already there is widespread apprehension that because this Ministry has come into power, the backward community people and other non-Brahmans will not get fair representation. May I know whether the Hon. Minister will give a categorical assurance that there will be no room for this fear? "

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—" I do not know why there is such an apprehension. I have already replied what has been done in the matter of selection. This year, one important change is the reservation of seats for discretionary allotment by Government has been discontinued."

SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI :—" May I know how many seats have been reserved for the students coming from Malabar, as there is no medical college in Malabar? "

31st July 1952]

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—"*Seats are reserved on the basis of population. Malabar and South Kanara get 11·4 per cent of the seats."

SRI S. T. ADITYAN :—" May I know how many marks were allotted for extra-curricular activities this year and how many marks were allotted for the same last year? "

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—" The interview marks this year for extra-curricular activities are 50. Last year no marks were assigned for this purpose and it was left to the Committee's discretion."

SRI LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI :—" May I know how many girl students from Rayalaseema applied for and obtained admission in this year and last year? "

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—" I have no information about the number of girl students who applied from Rayalaseema."

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—" Do the Government strictly follow the principle of adjusting *inter se* the 25 per cent and the 15 per cent allotted to the backward communities and the Harijans in case there was shortage in one or the other? That is, if there are not sufficient number of candidates in one of the communities, is adjustment made by taking from the other community and thus filling up the seats? "

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—" There is no lack of candidates from the backward communities. It will be easy to get the 25 per cent."

SRI K. V. VEMA REDDY :—" In view of the fact that there is the rule of merit in the matter of admission of boys and girls to the professional colleges, including the Medical College, and in view of the fact that those coming from the backward regions cannot compete with others coming from developed districts, who are intellectually superior on account of heritage of learning and better environments, will the Hon. the Minister for Health consider the advisability of relaxing the rules of admission so as to permit selection being made on a regional basis? " 8-50 a.m.

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—" Yes, Sir. Selection is made on a percentage basis from coastal Andhra districts, from Rayalaseema, from Tamil districts and from the West Coast."

Use of sea water for agricultural purposes.

* 297 *Q.*—SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR (on behalf of Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state whether the Government have directed any research on—

(*a*) the possibility of the use of sea water for agriculture especially coconut ; and

[31st July 1952

(*b*) the possibilities of sea water being converted into pure water fit for agriculture and drinking purposes?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—" (*a*) & (*b*) The answer is in the negative, except that the matter of research on rendering brackish or saline water potable has been gone into but the results are not yet ripe for publication."

Surveying of Munagala estate.

* 298 *Q.*—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state whether the Munagala estate is being surveyed?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" No. The survey of the estate has not yet been taken up."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" Are the Government aware of the fact that the zamindar of this estate is grabbing most of the lands and trying to make them home-farm lands because of the delay in surveying this estate? How many years will the Government take to survey this? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" I do not know whether grabbing and surveying is co-related. The fact is a small temporary staff has been sanctioned for each range for the survey of minor and scattered estates. Now the Board of Revenue has recommended that from the experience gained so far, it is found that the staff is too small to make any marked progress and has accordingly asked for sanction for the employment of a full section of sixty field surveyors with a proportionate strength of supervisory staff for each range to accelerate the pace of the survey work. The matter is under the consideration of the Standing Finance Committee."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" May I know from the Government whether they are prepared to give pattas to the peasants who are in possession of the lands in spite of the fact that the zamindar may put in his claims? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" The question of giving pattas will be considered later on."

Number of executions carried out in the year **1951.**

* 299 *Q.*—SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR (on behalf of Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state—

(*a*) how many executions have been carried out in the year 1951 in this State ; and

(*b*) in how many cases of capital sentence was clemency exercised?

31st July 1952]

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAYAR :—" (a) Thirty-one.

" (b) In eighteen cases."

DR. K. B. MENON :—" Have the Government the right to take away what they have not given? "

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I do not catch the Member."

DR. K. B. MENON :—" Have the Government the right to take away life which they have not given and, therefore, is the capital punishment justifiable? "

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Much has been said about this, Sir. At present, we have a right to consider the matter in connection with mercy petitions."

Grant of pattas of Government banjar lands in Anantapur district.

* 300 Q.—SRI T. NAGI REDDI : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that a large number of Adi-Andhras of Vajrakarur, Ganjikunta, Pyapili, Kothapalli villages of Anantapur district, are not yet given pattas of Government banjar lands which they have been cultivating for over a decade ; and

(b) if so, why they have not been given pattas?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" (a) & (b) The Government have no information in the matter but have called for the same from the Collector and his reply is awaited."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Sir, I have so far given notice of four or five questions and it is unfortunate that only one of them has been answered properly. About the rest, no information is available with the Government. All the same, Sir, may I request the Minister to see that steps are taken to prevent the eviction of these Harijans from the lands which they have been cultivating for the last ten years and to issue them pattas immediately? Will he bear in mind that not one of these people has been given a patta and not only that, they are also mercilessly thrown out of the lands? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" As far as the law allows, I shall certainly see that the sivoijamadars are not illegally ousted."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" May I know the law, Sir? Here is a law which is simple and clear. The sivoijamadars are allowed to cultivate the lands and those who have been cultivating them should not be evicted. That is the simple law in existence. All the same, may I bring to the notice of the Hon. the Minister for Revenue that in almost all the districts and especially in the Anantapur district,

some one thousand cases are pending with the Collector for the issue of pattas, and will the Government see that they are given pattas and evictions stopped?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"Yes, Sir, I shall try to accelerate the pace of the work."

Headquarters Hospital, Badagara.

* 301 Q.—SRI E. K. SANKARA VARMA RAJA : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether there was any proposal with the Government to shift the present site of the headquarters hospital at Badagara in Kurumbranad taluk to any other convenient place within the limits of the Badagara Panchayat Board; and

(b) if so, the reason for delay in executing the proposal?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—"(a) The answer is in the negative.

"(b) Does not arise."

Salary and allowances of the police constables.

* 302 Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state whether the Government have got any proposals to increase the salary and allowances of the police constables?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"No, Sir."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—"May I know from the Hon. the Chief Minister whether any representations have been received from associations of policemen in this connexion?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"Sir, I have not seen or looked into any representations and so I cannot answer this question. All that I am able to say is that there have been many revisions of their pay and finally, there was a revision and that was confirmed very recently. No change is now proposed."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—"A police constable gets the ordinary rate of allowance of twelve annas per day as daily allowance and if he travels outside the district, gets one rupee . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"I would request the hon. Member to proceed slowly."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—"Are the Government aware of the high cost of living and the need to increase the salaries and allowances of petty Government servants like the police constable and will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to reconsider this question and increase their allowances and salaries?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"The Government are very particular to have the loyalty of the Police force

31st July 1952]

intact and they will do everything that is necessary for this purpose, consistent with their finances. There is no division between the lower and the higher officers in regard to difficulties. They are all common difficulties and, at present, I might mention that the constables get, by the most recent revision, a pay of Rs. 30—40, dearness allowance, about twenty rupees, house rent allowance, seven rupees in the City and four in the mufassal and in addition a uniform allowance. Now, I do not think that this is too bad and I do not think that it should become a daily matter of question in the House. I must protest that the constable's salary need not be discussed every day in this House on an interpellation."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" On a point of order, Sir. The Hon. the Chief Minister says, almost speaking for the Chair or using the powers of the Speaker, that he will protest against questions regarding salaries of constables being discussed on the floor of the House every day. I would like to know whether he is entitled to speak like that and I want a ruling?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" It is not the Chief Minister but it is the hon. Member who is taking the position of the Speaker. I should explain that it is not for a Member to assume the functions of the Speaker. I deprecate this discussion. It is because I am very anxious that the loyalty of the police should not be bandied about here."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Not in this way?" 9 a.m.

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I know. I have made enough observations for the other side to understand what I mean."

Surveying of Chintalapadu Vanthu estate.

* 303 *Q.*—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state whether the Chintalapadu Vanthu estate is being surveyed and, if not, when is it going to be surveyed?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" The estate is not being surveyed. The survey of the estate will be taken up as soon as possible."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" Sir, in this estate many disputes are going on and the zamindar has taken over the Bobbillapadu tank. In cases where there is a dispute, I understand Government have issued orders not to remove the zamindar from possession of the lands. If that be so, I want to know how the Government are going to protect the interests of the peasants and see that the ' banjar ' lands, tank beds and other lands, are not grabbed by the zamindars?"

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member is making a speech."

[31st July 1952

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" I will summarize the question, Sir. (Laughter.) Because the survey is postponed year after year, are the Government aware that they are directly helping and instigating the zamindars to include all the lands as ' swantakavatam ' lands? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, what all I said about the other estates, namely, Munagala and the other one, applies to this estate also except that the name of the village is difficult to pronounce."

Serving of B. Memos. on landless classes cultivating poramboke lands.

* 304 Q.—DR. K. B. MENON : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state whether B. Memos. are being served and penalties levied for cultivation of porambokes by landless classes?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" B. Memoranda are reports submitted by the village officers to the Tahsildar or the Deputy Tahsildar concerned in respect of unauthorized occupations of Government lands. If the occupation is unobjectionable, only the assessment on the land is levied. If the occupation is objectionable, a notice is served on the encroacher asking him to show cause why penalty should not be levied in addition to assessment. In certain cases where the eviction of the encroachment is necessary in the interest of the public at large, the encroacher is also asked to vacate the land within the period specified in the notice and if he does not vacate the land, the encroacher is evicted from the land and any crop or other produce is forfeited to Government. The notices are served on the encroacher irrespective of the fact whether he is a member of the landless classes or not."

DR. K. B. MENON :—" Sir, will the Government consider the cancellation of penalties in such cases and also stop future levy in cases where the cultivation is *bona fide*? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" I do not exactly understand the hon. Member's question but still I will consider the question." (Laughter.)

JANAB MAHAMED SALIH MARAIKAYAR :—" Sir, before the inam villages were taken over by the Government, tank-beds and porambokes were brought under cultivation under the grow more food schemes by several persons in several villages in Arantangi taluk at great expense. So will the Government be pleased to grant pattas to those persons without evicting them? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Yes, Sir, pattas will be granted if they deserved them and when they are legal."

31st July 1952]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, in all these cases where they are charging these penalties, it is clear that the occupation and cultivation of lands are not objectionable from the point of view of public interest. Will the Government consider in such cases the question of cancelling the penalties where no public interest is involved? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, these penalties for unauthorized occupation vary in degree and at the time of the jamabandi they are generally settled in a very fair manner, in cases of unobjectionable encroachments. Permanent assignment is not possible in view of the fact that they are not assignable lands in some cases."

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—" Sir, are the Government aware that in a number of cases bogus political sufferers who have never gone to jail at any time are receiving pattas in preference to Harijan labourers? Is it labourers or the political sufferers that the Government want to encourage? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, first of all I want to know from the hon. Member what the term ' bogus political sufferers' connote."

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—" Sir, since a number of landless classes have been in possession of non-objectionable assignable lands for a number of years will the Government consider the desirability of passing orders to grant pattas because the cultivators themselves are incapable of asking for the issue of pattas? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Yes, Sir, that will be sympathetically looked into."

Management of Sri Brahadambal High School, Pudukkottai Division.

* 305 *Q.*—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether Sri Brahadambal High School and Rani's Girls' High School, Pudukkottai Division, Tiruchirappalli district, are under the control and ownership of the Madras Government;

(*b*) if so, from what date;

(*c*) whether the staff have been absorbed on Madras State High School service conditions;

(*d*) if not, why not;

(*e*) whether the Government are aware that despite G.O. No. 1734, dated 14th June 1951, from the Government of India, the staff of the Pudukkottai Rani's Girls' High School and Sri Brahadambal High School continue to receive only the Pudukottai State service salaries;

(*f*) whether the Government propose to remedy this state of affairs immediately; and

(*g*) whether repeated representations have been made to the authorities on the point?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" (*a*) & (*b*) The two private high schools referred to, were taken over by Government for management temporarily, soon after the merger, pending a final decision regarding the future management of similar educational institutions in the State. Orders were finally issued on the 5th August 1950 retaining the two high schools under Government control and management.

" (*c*) *to* (*f*) The question of the absorption of the staff of the two high schools in Government service, has been under the consideration of the Government and the various issues have now been finalized. Orders will issue very soon in the matter. Formal orders fixing the pay of the staff in the Government scales of pay, will be issued simultaneously.

" (*g*) Representations were received."

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—" May I know, Sir, on what basis these two schools are to be considered private schools, when they were already full-fledged Government schools? "

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" Sir, if the hon. Member means that they are Government schools because they belonged to the Pudukkottai State, in that sense, they were not private schools. That is accepted."

Duty imposed on the essence of Ayurvedic medicines.

* 306 *Q.*—SRI R. KRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Prohibition be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it has come to the notice of the Government that banana and pineapple essence containing 70 to 80 per cent alcohol as marked on the labels of their bottles, is sold in the market and if so (1) who are the manufacturers of this essence and (2) whether any one of them is in any way connected with any Ministers; and

(*b*) whether the Government have received any representation from Ayurvedic practitioners regarding the new duty imposed on the essence of Ayurvedic medicines?

THE HON. SRI V. C. PALANISWAMI GOUNDAR :—" (*a*) The sale of banana and pineapple essence containing 70 to 80 per cent alcohol was reported from some of the districts. They were imported into this State from Mysore, Travancore-Cochin, West Bengal and Hyderabad States under the protection of the reciprocal arrangements system now existing with these States. The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the recent notification about these essences.

(1) It is seen from the export permits that these essences are manufactured by the following companies in those States and are imported into this State :—

1 Messrs. Indian Chemical and Therapeutical Works, Limited, Calcutta.

31st July 1952]

2 Messrs. Chemical and Pharmaceutical Laboratory, Limited, Ernakulam.

3 Messrs. Josco Chemicals, Limited, Ernakulam.

4 Messrs. Navaratna Pharmaceutical Laboratory, Mattancherry.

5 Messrs. Hyderabad Chemical and Pharmaceutical Works, Limited, Hyderabad.

6 Messrs. Indian Chemical and Pharmaceutical Works, Limited, Hyderabad.

7 Messrs. Amrit Laboratories, Limited, Bangalore.

8 Messrs. Mysore Pharmaceuticals, Limited, Bangalore.

9 Messrs. Indian Process Chemical Laboratory, Bangalore.

(2) Government have no such information.

"(b) No new duty has been levied on Ayurvedic preparations. A memorandum by the representatives of All Kerala Ayurvedic Congress has been received by Government and it is under examination."

SRI R. KRISHNAN :—"Is there any law to prosecute those people who drink these essences? If so, what is it and in which year it was enacted?" 9.10 a.m.

THE HON. SRI V. C. PALANISWAMI GOUNDAR :— "The existing laws are enforced."

Ayurvedic preparations.

* 307 *Q.*—SRI T. ANANTHA PAI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Prohibition be pleased to state—

(*a*) the reasons for revoking all restrictions on tinctures while similar restrictions are allowed to continue on "Ayurvedic" preparations; and

(*b*) why a distinction is made between drugs containing self-generated alcohol and drugs to which alcohol is added?

THE HON. SRI V. C. PALANISWAMI GOUNDAR :— "(*a*) The restrictions imposed on spirituous medicinal preparations like Tinctures were removed to conform to the Supreme Court's judgment on the Bombay Prohibition Act. The question of liberalising the restrictions over Ayurvedic preparations is under the consideration of the Government.

"(*b*) The distinction is clear because in one case alcohol is self-generated while in the other alcohol is added. If the distinction referred to is with reference to the restrictions on these articles, Government are considering whether the restrictions on Ayurvedic preparations could be liberalized."

[31st July 1952

Report of the Technical Committee on the extraction of coal from Neyveli area.

* 308 Q.—SRI N. MAHALINGAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to place on the table of the House—

(a) the report of the Technical Committee on the extraction of coal from Neyveli area in South Arcot district; and

(b) state whether the Government are considering the utilisation of the iron ore in Salem district?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—"(a) The report[a] of the Committee of Experts and that of the High Power Committee regarding the extraction of lignite are placed on the table of the House.

"(b) The Government are considering the utilization of iron ore in the Salem district."

Construction of Tamidapadu tank in Udayagiri taluk.

* 309 Q.—SRI K. RAMAIAH CHOWDARY: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state the reasons for stopping the construction of Tamidapadu and Nakkalagandi tanks in Udayagiri taluk, Nellore district?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—"The question of stopping the schemes does not arise as the schemes have not yet been sanctioned. Plans and estimates in respect of both the schemes are awaited from the local officers."

Number of boring pumpsets in Udayarpalayam taluk.

* 310 Q.—SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) how many boring pumpsets were erected in 1937 in Udayarpalayam taluk in Tiruchirappalli district for providing drinking water facilities;

(b) how many of these are in working condition;

(c) what arrangements have the Government made to maintain these sets in good condition and to repair those which have gone out of repair;

(d) whether the Government are aware of the fact that in certain villages in that taluk these pumpsets are abandoned;

(e) what special steps were taken to prevent such abandonment and the resultant waste of money invested in the erection of these pumpsets;

(f) whether there is any scheme of extending the provision of pumpsets this year to some more villages affected by drought and scarcity of drinking water; and

(g) if not, what are the steps taken by the Government to overcome the water scarcity in such villages?

[a] Printed as Appendix I on pages 856–859 infra.

31st July 1952]

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—" (a) Twenty-one pumpsets were installed in 1937 in Udayarpalayam taluk.

" (b) Only two pumpsets are in working condition in that taluk.

" (c) The pumpsets were maintained by the Revenue Department till 1947 and since then, in the interest of better maintenance, this work has been entrusted to the Industries Department. The cost of repair is met by the local bodies concerned.

" (d) The answer is in the affirmative.

" (e) Instructions have been issued to the Director of Industries and Commerce to pay special attention to the repair and the maintenance of bore wells and to see that the efficiency of maintenance is improved.

" (f) The answer is in the negative.

" (g) Wells in these areas affected by adverse seasonal conditions are deepened under the Rural Water Supply Scheme to tide over the drinking water scarcity."

Representations re *the supersession of the Panchayat Board, Udangudi.*

* 311 Q.—SRI K. T. KOSALRAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any representation within the last three years from the public of Udangudi for the supersession of the panchayat board there;

(b) whether the District Panchayat Officer, Tirunelveli, has recommended the supersession; and

(c) the stage at which the matter stands?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—" (a) Yes.

" (b) Yes.

" (c) In 1950, the District Panchayat Officer suggested that the panchayat might be superseded. There were no sufficient grounds for taking such action against the panchayat and the Inspector directed the District Panchayat Officer to watch the administration of the panchayat. As the administration of the panchayat had improved, no further action was taken by the Inspector. In April 1952, a petition was received from certain residents of Udangudi making allegations against the panchayat. On enquiry the allegations were found to be untrue. There is no proposal to supersede the panchayat."

SRI K. T. KOSALRAM :—" May I know, Sir, whether the Hon. Minister has received several representations from the local

public very recently about the mal-administration and mismanagement of funds as given in the audit reports and will the Government instruct the Inspector of Local Boards to enquire into the affairs of the panchayat board?"

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—"Sir, when any serious allegations are made, they are all properly enquired into and if anything is found wrong, action will be taken."

Assets and liabilities of Pudukkottai State at the time of its merger with Madras State.

*312 Q.—

MR. SPEAKER :—"As the hon. Member, SRI V. Balakrishnan, is not in his seat, the answer will be printed in the proceedings."

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(*a*) the assets and liabilities of Pudukkottai State (now Pudukkottai Division of Tiruchirappalli district) at the time of its merger with Madras State;

(*b*) the total amount of revenue of Pudukkottai State immediately in the year prior to merger; and

(*c*) the total annual provincial revenues from Pudukkottai Division each year since merger (excluding income-tax) collected by the Madras Government?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"(*a*) Value of assets taken over—

		(RS. LAKHS.)
Buildings	..	51·25
Other assets	..	149·80
Total	..	201·05
Liabilities	..	39·23

"(*b*) Rs. 37,45,000 in fasli 1356 (rupees thirty seven lakhs forty-five thousand only).

		RS.	A.	P.
"(*c*) From 3rd March 1948 (date of merger) to end of..	1948–49	30,23,670	0	6
	1949–50	42,96,464	10	5

"No separate figures from the years 1950–51 onwards are available as the Pudukkottai State has been merged with the Tiruchirappalli district from 1st April 1950 for all accounts purposes."

31st July 1952]

Report about the firing in Salem Jail.

* 313 *Q.*—SRI K. MADHAVAN NAMBIAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state why the report of the Enquiry Committee appointed by Government to enquire into the Salem Jail Firing has not been published so far?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAYAR :—" The findings of the Committee were adverse to the prisoners inasmuch as they held that the story that the prisoners were indiscriminately fired on while they were sitting or sleeping in their blocks was not true, that the prisoners first made an unprovoked attack on the jail staff and that there was justification for opening fire but for which the jailor would have been done to death. As a criminal case was then pending against some of the prisoners involved in the incident and publication might give rise to the complaint that it seriously prejudiced the trial of the case, the report was not published then. Later, the publication of the report was not taken up because of lapse of time. Government have no objection to publish the report now if desired by any section of the House."

SRI K. MADHAVAN NAMBIAR :—" Can we expect the publication of the report before the next session of the Assembly and will the Government pay compensation to the families of the prisoners? "

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAYAR :—" The report will be published soon."

Salem Jail Shooting Enquiry Report.

* 314 *Q.*—SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state whether Government have any proposal to publish the Salem Jail Shooting Enquiry Report?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Yes. Hon. Member is referred to answer given to Legislative Assembly question No. 313."

Distribution of anti-pest chemicals to ryots.

* 315 *Q.*—

MR. SPEAKER :—" As the hon. Member, Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar, is not in his seat, the answer will be printed in the proceedings."

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Agricultural department collect the cost of chemicals sold as antidotes for agricultural pests to ryots whose crops have been affected by such pests ; and

(*b*) if so, whether the Government propose to distribute anti-pest chemicals free to those whose crops are actually affected by the pests, or are about to be?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—" (*a*) Pesticides and insecticides are sold by the Agriculture Department at half price to the ryots for application to food crops. In all the other cases full cost is collected.

" (*b*) No."

Absorption of police personnel of Pudukkottai State in Madras State Service.

9-20 a.m. * 316 *Q.*—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the entire personnel of the Police department of the pre-merger Pudukkottai State have been absorbed into the corresponding department of Madras State; and

(*b*) if so, when and on what service conditions, and if not, why not?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" (*a*) Yes, Sir.

" (*b*) All the personnel were absorbed with effect from 1st January 1949. They are given the Madras scales of pay which are more advantageous than what they were getting while in the State service. They were ordered to be on probation for a period of one year in the respective categories in which they were absorbed."

Number of suits for evictions filed in South Kanara district.

* 317 *Q.*—SRI Y. MANJAYA SHETTY : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state how many suits for evictions have been filed by landholders against their tenants in the District Munsifs' Courts of—

(1) Coondapoor;

(2) Udipi;

(3) Karkal;

(4) Mangalore;

(5) Puttur;

(6) Kasaragod; and

(7) Hosdrug

of South Kanara district in the years 1951 and 1952?

31st July 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" The number of eviction suits filed by landholders against their tenants in the District Munsif's Courts of South Kanara district in the years 1951 and 1952 (up to 30th June 1952) is as follows :—

	In the District Munsif's Court of	1951.	1952 (up to the end of June 1952).
1	Coondapoor ...	136	37
2	Udipi	215	94
3	Karkal	143	50
4	Mangalore	146	75
5	Puttur	97	46
6	Kasaragod	119	31
7	Hosdrug	159	51

MR. SPEAKER :—" Question No. 318. (At this stage the hon. Member Sri Y. Manjaya Shetty rose to put a supplementary question to question No. 317.) The hon. Member will please put a separate question."

Daily batta admissible to police constables for railway journeys.

* 318 *Q.*—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO : Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state what the daily batta paid to police constables is when they travel and when they stay at places outside the headquarters?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" A statement[a] is placed on the table."

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—" May I know, Sir, on what basis is this daily batta actually fixed? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" On long practice, Sir."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Is the Hon. Chief Minister satisfied that the long-standing practice is satisfactory? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" They are more or less satisfactory. Sir, it is very difficult to say a thing is satisfactory; but we have also to consider how much we can pay."

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—" May I know, Sir, if the old long-standing practice is being followed by the course of prices of foodstuffs? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" In lieu of that, daily allowance is given. We are again on the constables, Sir." (Laughter.)

[a] Printed as Appendix II on page 860 infra.

[31st July 1952

Concessions to copyists of the Revenue Department.

* 319 *Q.*—SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the copyists of the Revenue department are not given the concession regarding—

(1) pensions,

(2) leave allowance,

(3) house-rent allowance,

while copyists employed in the Judicial department are entitled to the above emoluments; and

(*b*) if so, what are the reasons for the distinction?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—
"(*a*) & (*b*) Copyists of the Revenue Department are not given the concessions regarding pension, leave allowance and House Rent Allowance. Copyists employed in the Civil Judicial Department are however allowed pension and leave allowance, but not House Rent Allowance.

"With the abolition of the Zamindaris and the introduction of the Scheme of Separation of the Judiciary from the Executive in many districts, there is little need for copyists, or at any rate for whole-time copyists, in the Revenue Department. Many of the Revenue Department Copyists have been absorbed in the Judicial Department in the districts where the separation scheme has been introduced. It has been decided to extend the concessions already admissible to the copyists of the Civil Judicial Department to those in the Judicial Magistrates' Courts under the separation scheme also. The orders have not been issued pending receipt of certain particulars from the High Court. When these orders are issued, such copyists will be eligible for the concessions admissible to the Judicial Department copyists. As it is not possible to forecast with accuracy the number of whole-time copyists if any, that will be retained in the Revenue Department and the average emoluments they are likely to earn after the separation scheme has been extended throughout the State, the Government have deferred consideration of the question of granting pensionary and leave benefits to the Revenue Department copyists till the scheme of separation of the Judiciary from the Executive is extended completely in the whole State."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Is the Hon. Minister aware of the fact that copyists in the Civil Judicial Department are drafted mainly from the Revenue Department? Will the Government therefore consider the desirability of granting them the House Allowance, as in the case of other Government servants? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—
" I shall examine, Sir."

31st July 1952]

Number of Factory Inspectors in the State.

* 320 *Q.*—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of Factory Inspectors in the State;

(*b*) their functions;

(*c*) the number of Assistant Inspectors of Labour in the State; and

(*d*) their functions and extent of jurisdiction?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" (*a*) Eight Regional Inspectors, 14 Inspectors and 1 Inspectress of Factories.

" (*b*) Their duty is to administer the provisions of the following enactments :—

The Cotton Ginning and Pressing Factories Act, 1925 (Partially).

The Madras Maternity Benefit Act, 1934.

The Payment of Wages Act, 1936.

The Employment of Children Act, 1938.

The Madras Shops and Establishments Act, 1947.

The Factories Act, 1948.

The Minimum Wages Act, 1948.

" (*c*) 199.

" (*d*) The Assistant Inspectors of Labour are mainly concerned with the administration of Madras Shops and Establishments Act. They are also appointed as 'Additional Inspectors' under the Factories Act, 1948, and are entrusted with the inspection of non-power factories and all hotels and restaurants. They enforce the provisions of the Payment of Wages Act, Madras Maternity Benefit Act, Minimum Wages Act and Employment of Children Act, in the factories and establishments they inspect. Besides these items of regular work they are also entrusted with the work of periodical checking of the requirements of coal and coke of consumers and submitting monthly returns.

" A statement[a] showing the jurisdictions of the Assistant Inspectors of Labour has been placed on the table of the House."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" May I know, Sir, whether the Government prosecute those owners of factories who infringe the regulations of the Factories Act? For instance, a complaint had been made to the Inspector of Factories that the owners of the Vuyyur Sugar Factory had failed to carry out the instructions embodied in the Factories Act; but we find that steps to launch prosecutions have not yet been taken. May

[a] Printed as Appendix III on pages 860–865 infra.

[31st July 1952

I know, Sir, whether the Government will supply us with the information in regard to cases wherein the owners of factories have been prosecuted for disobeying the Factories Act? "

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" When a complaint is received by the Inspector of Factories, he examines it and provided there are enough grounds for prosecution, the owner is punished. As to the latter part of the question, I want notice, Sir."

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—" With reference to answer to clause (d), may I know whether the extent of jurisdiction of Assistant Inspectors of Factories is curbed due to the number of shops they have to inspect or to the number of miles they have to travel? "

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Each Assistant Inspector of Factories has to inspect between 1,000 and 1,500 establishments. That is how the jurisdiction is divided."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" From the replies given by the Hon. Minister, I gather that proper maintenance of hygienic conditions in the factories is not being insisted upon by Government. I would like to have a reply from the Hon. Minister in this connexion."

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Even at present, the Inspector of Factories is expected to look into the proper upkeep of sanitary conditions in the factories. My hon. Friend seems to doubt it. Without committing myself, let me tell my hon. friend that if he brings to my notice specific cases, I would look into them."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Is the Hon. Minister aware of the fact that they had deputed one of their own medical officers to specialize in industrial hygiene, and that after specialization the services of that officer (Sri R. V. Subramaniam) are not being utilized in the proper direction but that he is employed as an Additional Professor in the Medical College. Will the Government consider appointing specialists in industrial hygiene to look into the proper upkeep of these factories, Sir? "

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" The hon. Member has brought this specific instance to my notice, a week ago. I may inform him that the matter is being looked into."

SRI M. JAGANNATHAN :—" The Hon. Minister had stated that there are at present 199 Assistant Inspectors of Factories. May I know how many of them are Harijans? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member may put a separate question."

Aboriginals in Kannavam forest area.

* 321 Q.—

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar is not in his place. The answer will be printed in the proceedings."

31st July 1952]

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state whether the Government are aware that the Forest department is driving out hundreds of aboriginals (Kurichiars) from their ancient abodes in the forests of Kannavam (Kottayam taluk, Malabar district)?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—" It is not true that the Forest department is driving out hundreds of aboriginals (Kurichiars) from their ancient abodes in the forests of Kannavam."

SRI Y. MANJAYA SHETTY :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to put some supplementary questions with regard to my question No. 317. I request I may be allowed some time for the same, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member can give notice of a separate question. I cannot allow the hon. Member any more time."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" On a point of information, Sir, I understand that it had been the practice during 1937 to print the answers and give them to the hon. Members who had given notice of the questions. As there are many hon. Members in this House who are not well acquainted with the English language, I think, it would be better if the Government were to give written answers so that hon. Members may read them beforehand and be prepared to put any supplementary questions, if necessary. This will also save some time, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" We are not following that practice anywhere now. When an answer is printed, then it becomes a written question. Anyhow I would like to know what the Hon. Chief Minister has to say in the matter."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I was not closely following the discussion, Sir. But I think it relates to the feasibility of supplying written answers to starred questions so that more supplementaries are put later on. We are not following that practice now either here or in the Parliament at Delhi. Of course it is a worthwhile suggestion. But at the same time I would like to say that we cannot take a decision on the same in a hurry, because we would be changing our present practice and we have to be careful while doing so."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" I am glad, Sir, that the Hon. Chief Minister had said that he would consider the suggestion. I would like to inform the Hon. Chief Minister that the suggestion if given effect to, would not lead to unnecessary supplementary questions but will enable hon. Members to put more informed questions."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" And many more speeches also, Sir." (Laughter.)

[31st July 1952

MR. SPEAKER :—"This is not the practice either in the House of Commons or in the Parliament at Delhi. When an answer is given in print, then it becomes a written question."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"May I also humbly submit to the Chair that it should not be pleased to come to immediate conclusions when there is a likelihood that we may come to another decision after some delay."

MR. SPEAKER :—"I would like to inform the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that I had not come to any immediate conclusion. I only stated that it was not the practice both in the House of Commons in England or in the Parliament at Delhi. I have not given any judgment."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"You are perfectly right, Sir. I only submit that the matter can be looked into in detail by the Rules Committee which is now going to be constituted, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—"I had only stated that that practice is not followed either at Delhi or in England. If the Hon. Chief Minister says 'yes', I have no objection."

9-30 a.m. THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"While the matter is being considered, let hon. Members on the other side give thought to another aspect of the matter. Supposing the answer to the primary question is printed and circulated, it loses the value of an answer to an oral question. Supposing a supplementary question is asked thereon, are we to print the answer to the supplementary question also to enable other supplementary questions to be put? What then is the advantage?"

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"What I submit is this: this point has now incidentally arisen, and all of us are not able to give full thought to it. Let us hope that it will be discussed fully in the Rules Revision Committee."

AN HON. MEMBER :—"On a point of information, Sir . . ."

MR. SPEAKER :—"Let the hon. Member come to my Chamber and tell me whatever doubt he has. I shall clear his doubt."

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS.

Expenditure incurred on account of Industrial development.

8 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state the amount of expenditure incurred by the Government from April 1940 to the end of March 1952 in each district of this State on account of Industrial Development?

A.—A statement[a] containing the information is placed on the table of the House.

[a] Printed as Appendix IV on page 866 infra.

31st July 1952]

Supply of iron and steel for agricultural purposes.

9 Q.—SRI C. R. RAMASWAMI : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether orders were placed for certain categories of mild steel flats (cart tyres) during 1951;

(b) under whose advice were such orders placed;

(c) whether it affected the supply position of steel in this State;

(d) whether any action was taken against the officers concerned for such planning; and

(e) what steps have been taken to plan the requirements in regard to steel for the future?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The procedure followed in placing orders for the requirements of iron and steel for agricultural purposes is as follows :—

The requirements of each district of iron and steel for agricultural purposes are initially estimated by the Deputy Registrar of Co-operative Societies concerned in consultation with the District Co-operative Wholesale Stores who are the distributors and the District Agricultural Officer and the estimates are sent to the Registrar of Co-operative Societies. The Registrar of Co-operative Societies consolidates the estimates from all the Deputy Registrars and communicates them to the Joint Director of Agriculture. Similarly the Director of Industries and Commerce and the Superintending Engineer (Food Production) furnish to the Joint Director of Agriculture, their estimates of their requirements. The Joint Director of Agriculture, prepares the indent category-wise for the whole State and submits it through the Director of Controlled Commodities to the Government in the Food and Agriculture (Food Production) Department who forward it to the Government of India in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Agriculture). On the basis of the indents received from the States, the Government of India make allotments to each State for each quarter. The State Steel Advisory Board which consists of official and non-official members (including the representatives of the iron and steel trade) scrutinizes the estimated requirements as indented for with reference to the allotment actually made by the Government of India for each quarter and decides about the quantities to be indented for by the Registered Stockists from the producers in respect of each category against the total allotment. The Registered Stockists place indents on the producers category-wise as decided by the Board.

(c) The supply position in the State has been affected due to a sudden rush of supplies of cart tyres (flats) from the producers in quick succession. The supplies relate to indents for certain periods of 1949, 1950 and 1951 which the producers failed to meet within a reasonable time. There was a considerable time lag between the placing of indents by this Government and the actual receipt of the materials from the producers. The indents were based on the estimated demand from the ryots, but the demand for particular categories of materials from ryots varies with the lapse of time. Financial stringency, slump in the money market and the famine conditions in some districts also contributed to some extent indirectly to the decrease in demand. As a result, the co-operative societies were unable to take delivery of the large quantities of flats sent by the producers as they apprehended lack of buyers. There has consequently been an accumulation of flats. If the producers had met the State indents regularly and in time, the accumulation could have been avoided.

(d) As will be seen from the answers to clauses (b) and (c), the estimates of requirements were formulated with reference to the probable demand, in consultation with the distributing agencies and the indents were placed with the producers after consulting the State Steel Advisory Board which includes representatives of the trade. The accumulation of stocks was not due to wrong planning by any officer, but was due to irregular supply by the producers.

(e) Indents are now placed taking into account the existing stocks with the registered stockists and the indents still pending for which supplies are yet to be received and eliminating categories for which there is no demand.

Investigation of lignite in South Arcot district.

10 Q.—Sri K. KRISHNA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) the stage at which the exploitation of lignite deposits in South Arcot stands; and

(b) whether the Government have investigated the occurrence of coal deposits in Madras coast and Gondwana area of Godavari alluded to in page 17 of the Preliminary Report of the Industrial Planning Committee (1947), and if so, with what results?

A.—(a) The investigation of ligmite in South Arcot district carried out by means of boreholes and a shaft has revealed the existence of lignite in an area of about

31st July 1952]

100 square miles at a depth of about 175 feet from ground-level. The lignite deposits are sandwiched between two layers of water-bearing beds. The extraction of bulk samples of lignite from a shaft in September 1951 has shown that the difficult underground conditions can be successfully overcome. The underground conditions have, however, to be studied in greater detail before launching on large-scale mining operations. A pilot quarrying scheme estimated to cost Rs. 79 lakhs has, therefore, been prepared to ascertain the actual underground conditions that may be experienced in large-scale mining. In view of the huge cost involved, the Government of India were addressed to take up the work as a Central Government scheme or in the alternative to transfer to this Government, the necessary machinery available with them The Government of India have since agreed to transfer some items of essential machinery worth about Rs. 15 lakhs. The question of taking up the scheme with the items of machinery offered by India is under consideration.

(b) Geological investigations conducted by the Geological Survey of India indicated the possibility of coal in the Godavari valley. The Government sanctioned in October 1949 an expenditure up to Rs. 94,000 for putting down boreholes in three places, viz., Ankanapalem, Darbagudem and Taduvayi in East Godavari district. But, the work could not be taken up as the calyx drill available with the Industries department had to be diverted for work in drought areas. The work will be taken up as soon as the calyx drill is available.

The Geological Survey of India has not so far suggested an investigation for ascertaining the existence of coal in the ' Madras Coast '.

List of journals and presses from which securities were demanded.

11 *Q.*—SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to place on the table of the House—

(*a*) a list of journals and presses asked to furnish securities and the amounts of security demanded from each in the past five years;

(*b*) whether any of these amounts have been forfeited; and

(*c*) if so, the circumstances under which the forfeiture was ordered?

A.—(*a*) to (*c*) A statement [a] is laid on the table of the House.

[a] Printed as Appendix V on pages 867–871 infra.

[31st July 1952

Total loss of revenue due to the introduction of Prohibition.

12 *Q.*—SRI V. GOPALA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Minister for Prohibition be pleased to state the total loss of revenue every year to the State by the introduction of Prohibition?

A.—The total loss of revenue to the State in each of the years 1946–47 to 1951–52, as compared with the peak revenue derived in 1945–46 which was the year previous to the introduction of Prohibition, has been as follows:—

Year.	Revenue.	Total loss.
	RS.	RS.
1945–46	16,41,16,898	..
1946–47	14,67,97,566	1,73,19,332
1947–48	10,68,91,529	5,72,25,369
1948–49	3,66,53,879	12,74,63,019
1949–50	58,55,879	15,82,61,019
1950–51	55,27,916	15,85,88,982
1951–52 (Up to March—Preliminary.)	38,38,774	16,02,78,124

Grant of pattas to Harijans in respect of Government lands.

13 *Q.*—SRI M. RAJESWARA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state the number of pattas (districtwar) granted to Harijans in the State up to 31st March 1952 in respect of Government porambokes and other banjar lands which were under their possession on 1st May 1948?

A.—The Government have no information in the matter. It has therefore been called for from the Collectors, and replies from some of them are awaited.

Total revenue derived from West Godavari district.

14 *Q.*—SRI M. RAJESWARA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state the total revenue derived by the Government from West Godavari district under all heads, during 1951–52?

A.—A statement[a] showing the total revenue derived by the Government from West Godavari district under all heads during 1951–52 is placed on the table of the House.

The receipts received in the District Treasury and sub-treasuries in a district do not represent the total receipts pertaining to the district as credits for some large receipts (e.g., share of income-tax) are received in the accounts of Madras City and are not allocated separately to each district."

[a] Printed as Appendix VI on page 872 infra.

31st July 1952]

Well Subsidy Scheme.

15 Q.—SRI M. RAJESWARA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state on a districtwar basis—

(a) the number of cases in which subsidies were granted under the well subsidy scheme up till now;

(b) the number of cases in which Harijans are given subsidies during the said period; and

(c) the amount spent under each of the above heads?

A.—(a) A statement [a] showing the particulars regarding the number of cases in which subsidies were granted under the various well subsidy schemes districtwar up till now is enclosed.

(b) Information regarding the subsidies granted to Harijans is not available as there is no column in the application for the grant of subsidy to show whether the individual to whom subsidy is granted is a Harijan or not. Further, it is not possible at this distance of time to collect the statistics correctly.

(c) Separate particulars regarding the amounts of subsidy spent for Harijans as well as for others are not available and in view of the reasons given in the answer to question (b) it is not possible to collect the statistics. However, a statement showing the total amount spent under the various wells schemes districtwar is printed as Appendix VII on page 873–874 supra for the information of the Member."

Instructions imparted in Basic Educational institutions.

16 Q.—SRI V. SANKARANARAYANA MENON: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) the standard up to which the Basic system of education has been reached in the State; and

(b) whether the Government have any proposal for the continuance of education in the same system for higher studies?

A.—(a) Instruction is now imparted in Basic Educational institutions in the following stages of Basic Education :—

(1) *Pre-Basic Education.*—For children of the age groups 2½ to 5 there are pre-Basic Sections (or schools) attached to Basic Schools. There are pre-Basic Sections attached to 27 Basic Schools.

(2) *Basic Education.*—For children above the age of 5, there are Basic Schools either with Grades I to V or with Grades I to VIII. Schools with Grades I to V are called Junior Basic Schools and those with

[a] **Printed as Appendix VII on pages 873–874 infra.**

[31st July 1952

Grades I to VIII are Senior Basic Schools. The number of Basic Schools so far opened in the State up to the period including 1951–52 is 507, of which 13 are Senior Basic Schools and the rest Junior Basic Schools.

(3) *Basic Training Schools.*—There are 56 Training Schools run on Basic lines.

(4) *Pre-Basic Training School.*—There is one such Training School to train teachers for the pre-Basic Sections or Schools.

(5) In the B.T. Degree of the Madras University, the subject of "Basic Education" is included as an optional subject. Basic Education is a compulsory subject to study for the Basic Education of the Andhra University.

(*b*) The higher stages of Basic Education include "Post-Basic Education" and Basic Education in the University stage. There are no Post-Basic Schools, nor Basic Training Colleges now, nor is any proposal for opening them pending now.

Taking over of zamin estates in Tanjore district.

17 *Q.*—Sri V BALAKRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether all zamin estates in Pudukkottai and Arantangi taluks of Tanjore district were taken by the Government on 3rd January 1951;

(*b*) if so, the names of such zamin estates;

(*c*) whether all or most of the Inam Estates were also taken over on 1st October 1951;

(*d*) the basis on which the collection of Revenue are made from (1) Zamin Estates and (2) Inam Estates;

(*e*) whether these lands have been surveyed and revenue assessment has been settled;

(*f*) if not; why not;

(*g*) whether the affected cultivators have complained to the Government or district authorities that the new assessment is exorbitant and unbearable;

(*h*) whether it is a fact that the fixation of the revenue assessment of lands in the dry and drought areas of Pattukkottai and Arantangi taluks is based on a comparison of rates with the rich delta areas of Budalore; and

(*i*) whether it is the principle of revenue assessment that for purposes of revenue levy comparison and contrast are made with the best lands in the adjoining area of the vattam or taluk and not of the district?

31st July 1952]

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) It is presumed that by "Pudukotta" the member is referring to the "Pattukkottai" taluk of the Tanjore district.

Ninety-four zamindari estates in Tanjore district were notified to be taken over on 3rd January 1951. Information as to how many of them are in Pattukkottai and Arantangi taluks is not readily available with the Government.

(*c*) Most of the inam estates were taken over on 1st October 1951.

(*d*) Under section 23 of the Estates Abolition Act, the land revenue payable to the Government on any land held for the purpose of agriculture (not being private land) in an estate taken over under that Act is the rent fixed for that land under the Rent Reduction Act.

(*e*) & (*f*) The settlement operations are proposed to be commenced shortly in the surveyed estates in these taluks. Survey work will be undertaken in those estates which have not been surveyed already.

(*g*) & (*h*) Under the Madras Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Second Amendment Act, 1951, on any ryoti land in an estate on which rent was payable in kind or partly in kind and partly in cash, if the aggregate money value of the reduced rent payable exceeds the assessment at the highest ryotwari rate of the district, then the rent at the highest ryotwari rate is only payable. Under section 23 of the Estates Abolition Act, when the estate is taken over, the rent at the highest ryotwari rate becomes payable to the Government as land revenue from the date the estate is taken over. Recently the ryots of the estates in the taluks of Pattukkottai and Arantangi requested that the land revenue payable by them be restricted to the highest ryotwari rate of the taluk. The Government were unable to comply with the request. The attention of the M.L.A. is invited to the Press Communiqué issued by the Government on 9th June 1952 which explains the position.

(*i*) No such principle is followed.

Number of Joint Registrars in the Co-operative department.

18 *Q.*—Sri V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state the number of Joint Registrars in the Co-operative department at present and the allocation of work among them?

A.—There are four Joint Registrars. The allocation of work among them is as follows:—

(1) *Joint Registrar* (*General*).—Subordinate establishment of the department, namely, peons, clerks, typists,

[31st July 1952

Junior Inspectors, Senior Inspectors and to some extent Co-operative Sub-Registrars, Rural Credit Societies, Urban Banks, Supervising Unions, Consumers' Societies, Urban Housing Societies, Marketing Societies and Federations, Controlled Credit Scheme, and Producer-*cum*-Consumers' Co-operative Societies.

(2) *Additional Joint Registrar.*—(*a*) Statutory duties like audit, arbitration, execution and liquidation including appeals arising in these matters; (*b*) dairy development scheme and livestock improvement; (*c*) Cottage Industries Societies, other than weaver societies; (*d*) Work relating to committees and conferences; and (*e*) Harijan Welfare and Societies for Backward Classes.

(3) *Joint Registrar (Prohibition Amelioration).*—Ameliorative activities, connected with Prohibition providing employment to the ex-tappers by forming jaggery manufacturing co-operative societies, multipurpose co-operative societies, etc. Rural housing schemes, firka development schemes, and food production through village co-operatives.

(4) *Joint Registrar (Resettlement).*—Resettlement of ex-servicemen through Co-operatives, viz., (1) Co-operative workshops; (2) Motor Transport Co-operative Societies; and (3) Land Colonization Co-operative Societies. Co-operative Land Colonization Societies for civilians, co-operative farming, irrigation, agricultural improvements and demonstration societies and community projects in the State. Preparation of the Administration Report of the Department.

Grant of subsidy to owners of dairy farms.

19 *Q.*—Sri A. APPU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Director of Animal Husbandry has submitted proposals to revise the rules regarding grants of subsidy to owners of dairy farms;

(*b*) if so, what the proposals suggested by the Director are: and

(*c*) whether the Government will place a copy of the Director's report on the table of the House?

A.—(*a*) No, Sir.

(*b*) & (*c*) Does not arise.

31st July 1952]

Loans granted under the Madras State Aid to Industries Act.

20 Q.—Sri PRAGADA KOTAIAH : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state the names and addresses of the Industrial concerns and the loan amount distributed to each during the year 1951–52 under the provisions of the Madras State Aid to Industries Act?

A.—A statement [a] showing the names and addresses of Industrial concerns and the loan amount distributed to each during the year 1951–52 under the provisions of the Madras State Aid to Industries Act is placed on the table of the House.

Government Hospitals with Blood Banks.

21 Q.—Sri K. KRISHNA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state the names of District Headquarters Hospitals and Maternity Hospitals which have a functioning blood bank attached to them and those which have no blood bank attached to them?

A.—1. Blood Banks are functioning at present in the following Government hospitals in this State (District Headquarters and Maternity Hospitals) :—

(1) Government General Hospital, Madras.

(2) Government Stanley Hospital, Madras.

(3) Government Hospital for Women and Children, Madras.

(4) Government Pentland Hospital, Vellore.

(5) Government Headquarters Hospital, Bellary (* and Government Women and Children Hospital, Bellary).

(6) Government Headquarters Hospital, Coimbatore.

(7) Government Headquarters Hospital, Kakinadà.

(8) Government Headquarters Hospital, Guntur.

(9) Government Wenlock Hospital, Mangalore (* and Lady Goschen Hospital, Mangalore).

(10) Government Headquarters Hospital, Machilipatnam.

(11) Government Erskine Hospital, Madurai.

(12) Government Headquarters Hospital, Kozhikode (* and Government Women and Children Hospital, Kozhikode).

(13) Government Hospital, Fort Cochin.

(14) Government Headquarters Hospital, Ootacamund.

(15) Government Raja Mirasdar District Headquarters Hospital, Tanjore.

[a] Printed as Appendix VIII on page 875 infra.

* Patients admitted to the maternity hospitals are served by the blood banks functioning in the general hospitals of the respective stations.

[31st July 1952

(16) Government Headquarters Hospital, Palayamkottai (* and Government Women and Children Hospital, Vannarpet).

(17) Government Gandhiji Memorial District Headquarters Hospital, Tiruchirappalli (* and Maternity Hospital, Tiruchirappalli).

(18) King George Hospital, Visakhapatnam, (* and the Victoria Hospital for Women and Children, Visakhapatnam).

2. There are no blood banks in the following Government hospitals (District Headquarters and Maternity hospitals) :—

(1) Kasturba Gandhi Hospital for Women and Children, Madras.
(2) Government Rajah Sir Ramaswamy Mudaliyar's Lying-in-Hospital, Madras.
(3) Government Headquarters Hospital, Anantapur.
(4) Government Headquarters Hospital, Cuddalore.
(5) Government Headquarters Hospital, Chingleput.
(6) Government Headquarters Hospital, Chittoor.
(7) Government Headquarters Hospital, Cuddapah.
(8) Government Headquarters Hospital, Eluru.
(9) Government Headquarters Hospital, Kurnool.
(10) Government Headquarters Hospital, Nellore.
(11) Government Headquarters Hospital, Ramanathapuram.
(12) Government Headquarters Hospital, Salem (and Queen Alexandra Hospital, Salem).

[*Note.*—**An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.**]

II.—ADJOURNMENT MOTION *RE* MOVEMENT FOR THE ERASURE OF PLACE-NAMES IN HINDI FROM THE NAME BOARDS IN RAILWAY STATIONS IN TAMIL NAD.

MR. SPEAKER :—" Mr. Ramamurthi has given notice of an adjournment motion which reads as follows :—

' The House be adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the movement for the erasure of place names in Hindi from the nameboards in railway stations in Tamil Nad which has been scheduled to be started by Sri E. V. Ramasami Naicker, and the orders of the Government to arrest a large number of persons who have notified their intention to take part in the movement.'

" Let me tell the House that this motion does not deal with a single definite matter. Mr. Ramamurthi has put together two definite matters. The first one is regarding Mr. Ramaswami Naicker's movement. As regards this, firstly, the House has

*** Patients admitted to the maternity hospitals are served by the blood banks functioning in the general hospitals of the respective stations.**

31st July 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

nothing to do with it; secondly, the Government are not responsible for the movement. The second matter is that Government have passed certain orders. I do not know whether Government have passed any orders or not; anyway, their orders will come under the category of day-to-day administration. I therefore rule the motion out of order."

(Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah stood up in his seat.)

MR. SPEAKER :—" Whatever the hon. Member wants to say, let him come to me in my Chamber and inform me, and I will clear his doubts, if any."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—" On a point of privilege, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member has not given notice of any privilege motion; how can he move the privilege motion all of a sudden? "

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—" It is only a point of privilege, not a motion of privilege."

MR. SPEAKER :—" All right, let me hear what he wants to say."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of privilege, కోత తీర్మానాలు ఇచ్చినప్పుడు, వాటికి జవాబు చెప్పది కష్టంగా ఉంటుంది గనుక, ఈ కోత తీర్మానాలు ఎవరైతే ఇస్తారో, వారికే జవాబు పంపిస్తే బాగుంటుంది. ఇంతకుముందు ప్రధానమంత్రిగారు ప్రశ్నలకు జవాబు పంపించే విషయము ఆలోచిస్తామన్నారు. ఆ విధంగానే కోత తీర్మానాలకు కూడా జవాబు పంపించే పద్ధతి అమలు జరిపి ఆచరణలో పెట్టినట్లైతే చాలా బాగుంటుంది. కనుక ఆ ప్రకారము చేయవలసిందని ప్రధానమంత్రిగారిని కోరుచున్నాను."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I shall now repeat what the hon. Member has said in Telugu. The Hon. Chief Minister was pleased to say, with regard to questions that are not answered, that the information when obtained may be communicated to the Member concerned. He now wants the Hon. Chief Minister to follow up that suggestion with regard even to cut motions which have not been taken up in the House, and that the replies which the Hon. Ministers might have given to those cut motions if there was time, might be communicated to the Members."

MR. SPEAKER :—" This is not the time for the hon. Member to make such requests. Simply because I am ignorant of Telugu language, he should not take advantage of it and say firstly, that it is a point of order, then that it is a point of privilege, and later say all these things. I won't allow the hon. Member to do so once again.

" We now proceed to the next item on the Agenda."

III.—GOVERNMENT MOTIONS.

(1) MOTION UNDER RULE 24 OF THE MADRAS ASSEMBLY RULES.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

'*That Rule 24 of the Madras Assembly Rules be suspended and the House do resolve to transact Government business on Thursday, the 31st July 1952.*' "

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" There is no objection, Sir; but I would like to have some information. I should like to know whether the Government will be able to give us instead of this day some other day immediately following, so that we can have a non-official day immediately? That is what I am requesting. There must be many resolutions received, and I think the Hon. Speaker must have an idea of them. One of those resolutions may come before the House, and we can have a chance to discuss it if a non-official day is allotted now."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" If the Hon. Leader of the House is willing to give a day, no further discussion is necessary, Sir."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" The question is whether we can immediately give a day, i.e., tomorrow or the day after. Unfortunately, all the Members are anxious to finish the business to-day, even if necessary by sitting till six o'clock in the evening."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Most of the Members, I think, have already booked their seats in the trains for returning home."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Therefore, it is not possible to allot a day 'immediately'; but if it is to be in the next session, certainly I will consider the suggestion; and if necessary, we shall even allot another extra day for non-official business."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

'That rule 24 of the Madras Assembly Rules be suspended and the House do resolve to transact Government business on Thursday, the 31st July 1951.' "

The motion was carried.

(2) NOTIFICATION MADE BY THE GOVERNOR UNDER FIRST PROVISO TO SECTION 3 (1) OF THE MADRAS SALES OF MOTOR SPIRIT TAXATION ACT, 1939.

* THE HON. SRI S. B. P. PATTABHI RAMA RAO :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

'*That the following notification made by the Governor of Madras, under the first proviso to section 3 (1) of the Madras Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939 (Madras Act VI of 1939) be approved :—*

NOTIFICATION.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 3 (1) of the Madras Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939 (Madras Act VI of 1939), the Governor of

31st July 1952] [Sri S. B. P. Pattabhi Rama Rao]

Madras hereby fixes six annas per gallon as the rate at which tax shall be levied under that Act, on all retail sales of petrol, with effect on and from the date on which this notification is approved by a resolution of the Legislative Assembly.'

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in moving this, I beg to state that hon. Members are aware of the circumstances under which the Madras Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Ordinance came to be promulgated in June 1952. It was promulgated so quickly that there was no loss of revenue due to the notification having been forestalled by the Press. Usually an ordinance has to be replaced by an Act of the Legislature within six weeks of the day on which the Assembly reassembles. In this case, however, the Government can alter the rate of taxation by some notification, but section 3 (1) of the Madras Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939, requires that the notification should be approved by the Legislative Assembly, and hence the necessity for this resolution. The Government have examined the question whether it is necessary to validate or ratify the Ordinance, and have considered it unnecessary to do either. The resolution says that the enhanced rate will take effect from the date on which the notification is approved by a resolution of the Assembly. As the Ordinance mentions the same rate of tax, viz., 6 annas, it is not necessary to make any alteration now, and no legal complications will follow. The Ordinance will automatically cease to be valid after six weeks, and thereafter the rate as approved by the House will be in force. Hence I request the House to adopt this resolution."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Motion moved—

'That the following notification made by the Governor of Madras under the first proviso to section 3 (1) of the Madras Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939 (Madras Act VI of 1939), be approved :—

NOTIFICATION.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 3 (1) of the Madras Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939 (Madras Act VI of 1939), the Governor of Madras hereby fixes six annas per gallon as the rate at which tax shall be levied under that Act on all retail sales of petrol, with effect on and from the date on which this notification is approved by a resolution of the Legislative Assembly.' "

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, I have got some difficulties and I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister to them. The motion says 'That the following notification made by the Governor . . . be approved'. Firstly, the date when the notification is made is not given. I want to raise two objections. They amount to points of order and I take them as points of order. 9-40 a.m.

" The first point of order is this. Under section 3 (1) of the Madras Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, the rate of tax can be

altered by a notification made by the Governor and that notification should be approved by a resolution of the Legislative Assembly. The Act is an old Act of 1939. No doubt it is in force, and to that extent this resolution is valid. But I submit that the Constitution has changed the whole position. To the extent to which this Act is against the terms of the Constitution, it is invalid. That is a proposition with which you will certainly agree. Article 265 is one of the shortest but one of the greatest Articles of our Constitution. It says ' No tax shall be levied or collected except by authority of law '. I submit that this is one of the safeguards in the interests of democracy. The Madras Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act says that the notification of the Governor increasing the rate of tax should be approved by a resolution of the Legislative Assembly. I submit that a resolution of the Assembly is no law at all. A law, as you know, must have all the component parts of a legislation like a Preamble, short title, etc., and must have passed through all its three stages. A mere resolution of the Assembly will not enable the Government, after the coming into force of the Constitution, to increase the rate of tax."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The wording of Article 265 is that no tax shall be levied or collected except by ' authority of law ' and not ' by law '."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Only when there is law, there will be authority. I think it is better for this new Legislature to understand the implications of that very short but very pithy Article 265. ' By authority of law ' means authority which the Government get by the passing and after the passing of a law. The Act of 1939 is a law passed by the previous Legislature. To the extent to which its provisions are against Article 265 of the Constitution, the old law is invalid and unenforceable. Increasing the rate by a notification and then passing a resolution approving of that notification is clearly invalid and *ultra vires*. Therefore I submit that we cannot consider this resolution at all.

" The second point of order is this. The resolution now on the agenda says that the Governor fixes six annas per gallon as the rate with effect on and from the date on which this notification is approved by a resolution of the Legislative Assembly. Let us assume that the resolution will be passed. Then it will come into effect from to-day. Article 213 of the Constitution says—

> ' An Ordinance shall cease to operate at the expiration of six weeks from the reassembly of the Legislature or if before the expiration of that period a resolution disapproving it is passed by the Legislative Assembly.'

Therefore the Ordinance cannot discharge itself unless the Hon. Leader of the House brings forward a legislation disapproving of it. We will certainly welcome such a resolution. The Ordinance continues to be in force till six weeks from 27th June 1952, the date of reassembly of the Legislature. The Hon. Minister moves

a resolution that the revised rate of tax shall come into effect from to-day. There is a conflict. The wording of the resolution is not good and has to be modified.

"On the grounds referred to above, I object to this resolution. We raise these points not to be legalistic, or quibble with law, but to safeguard the democratic rights of the citizens. One of the most important rights of democracy is that we shall not be taxed except under the authority derived from law. When there is no law and the Government want to impose tax by a mere resolution of the Legislature, it is making a breach into the democratic rights of the people, a breach into the Articles of the Constitution. Therefore I submit that this motion moved by the Hon. Minister for Rural Welfare is out of order and I pray it may be ruled out of order."

SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL :—"Sir, I want to raise another point of order. The motion before the House is—

'That the following notification made by the Governor of Madras under the first proviso to section 3 (1) of the Madras Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939 (Madras Act VI of 1939). be approved.'

"The notification is covered by the Ordinance which says:

'Notwithstanding anything contained in section 3, sub-section (1) of the Madras Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939 (Madras Act VI of 1939), or in any notification issued thereunder, there shall be levied on all retail sales of petrol effected after the commencement of this Ordinance a tax at the rate of six annas per gallon ; and the Act aforesaid shall have effect accordingly.'

What the Government want to do is to enhance the tax on a gallon of petrol by two annas after obtaining the approval of this House for this notification. My submission to the House is that our legislative powers have been completely defined in Article 246 of the Constitution. For the benefit of the House I shall read out that Article—

'246 (1) Notwithstanding anything in clauses (2) and (3), Parlaiment has exclusive power to make laws with respect to any of the matters enumerated in list I in the Seventh Schedule (in this Constitution referred to as the 'Union List)'.

(2) Notwithstanding anything in clause (3), Parliament, and, subject to clause (1), the Legislature of any State specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule also. have power to make laws with respect to any of the matters enumerated in list III in the Seventh Schedule (in this Constitution referred to as the 'Concurrent List).'

(3) Subject to clauses (1) and (2), the Legislature of any State specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule has exclusive power to make laws for such State or any part thereof with respect to any of the matters enumerated in List II in the Seventh Schedule (in this Contitution referred to as the 'State List).'

The powers of this Legislature and the subjects on which this House can legislate are mentioned in the State List and also in the Concurrent List. In the. State List there are 66 items and in the Concurrent List there are 47 items. In these lists we do not find the word 'petrol'. On the contrary if we look into the Union list, item 53, we find the word 'petroleum'. Sir, this subject is not

within the purview of this House, and this House has no right to legislate on a subject which is within the purview of the Central Legislature. It may be argued by the Government that in view of Article 277 (which gives certain powers to the State Governments) this law, which has already been in existence, is still in force, and, therefore, they can levy the tax. But here, the Government want to collect some more tax from the people, and that does affect the fundamental rights mentioned in Article 13. Article 13 of the Constitution says that all laws in force in the territory of India immediately before the commencement of this Constitution, in so far as they are inconsistent with the provisions of this Part, shall, to the extent of such inconsistency, be void. My submission is that Act VI of 1939 is void. Even if the Speaker were to hold that Act VI of 1939 is not void, then I say that the present taxation is void, because the word 'petroleum' does not come in any of the two lists, namely, State List and Concurrent List. Further, day before yesterday, the Indian Parliament passed an Act declaring certain articles as essential articles. Parliament has stated that all laws which shall be passed by any State shall not be valid unless they receive the assent of the President. This is reported in the *Hindu* of the 29th instant. The report says—

'The House of the People to-day passed the Essential Goods (Declaration and Regulation of Tax on Sale or Purchase) Bill. The measure seeks to declare certain goods as essential for the life of the community. No law, made after the commencement of this Act, by the Legislature of State imposing sales-tax on these goods will have effect unless it has received the assent of the President.'

Of course, it has stated so many articles. *Inter alia* it has mentioned petrol. My submission is that petrol is a subject which entirely falls within the purview of the Union List, and, as such, this Legislature has no power at all to legislate in this matter. We are legislating on a forbidden subject. My submission to the Speaker is . . ."

MR. SPEAKER :—"I understand the hon. Member. He says that it is *ultra vires* of this Legislature, to legislate on the subject of petrol."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"Sir, I rise to support the point of order raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. Under Article 265, no tax shall be levied or collected except by the authority of law. The whole question revolves round the interpretation of the words 'authority of law'. What exactly is law, is the question. I would like to refer to Article 3 of the Constitution to understand what exactly the framers of the Constitution mean by the word 'law'. The proviso to Article 3 says—

'Provided that no Bill for the purpose shall be introduced in either House of Parliment except on the recommendation of the President and unless, where the proposal contained in the Bill affects the boundaries of any State or States, specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule or the name or names of of any such State or States, the views of the Legislature of the State or, as the case may be, of each of the States both with respect to the proposal to introduce the Bill and with respect to the provisions thereof have been ascertained by the President.'

31st July 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

The normal procedure in all Parliaments (it has been the normal practice in this Legislature also all along) has been first of all to publish a Bill and give notice of that Bill to the Members of the Legislature and also the public, so that Members of the Legislature can have sufficient time to think over the implications of the provisions of the Bill. Afterwards, a certain procedure is followed for the purpose of passing that Bill into law. Any law affects the people of the State. That is why this elaborate procedure has been laid down. Now to come forward and say that a resolution passed by the House is itself law, will stultify the very provision that has been made in the Constitution. Therefore, the point of order raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is very correct."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, the point raised is that a resolution is not a law, and, therefore, this levy of a tax by a resolution is not legal. That is what the Leader of the Opposition laid stress on and what the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi confirmed in his argument. The question, however, is not that. The question is whether the law which was passed in 1939 has, at present, validity or not. That is the first question to be decided. There is a provision in the Constitution which says that all existing laws, in spite of anything else, unless they are specifically repealed, are valid. Article 372 therefore provides for the continuance of Madras Act VI of 1939. That is the first thing to be decided. Nobody contends now that the Madras Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939, has been repealed, for the result then would be that we cannot collect even the existing rate. That law is alive and is in force.

" The next question is, what is the authority for levying the tax. It is that same law under which we levy the present tax that gives authority for exercising power to levy a new addition to the tax by way of a notification. If the Act of 1939 is alive, that law gives us the power, by a resolution, to adopt the notification and approve of the notification, and levy the tax.

" Then the argument was advanced that apart from the existing law being enforced, we must go back to the general principles and see whether any tax could be levied by a mere notification. 10 a.m.

" Now it comes to this. Supposing to-day a Bill is placed before this House and it is passed into an Act empowering the Government to levy an increased duty from time to time by means of a notification, nobody can contend that it would be illegal, because the Courts have decided that delegated authority is lawful and can be authorized by Parliament or by other Legislatures. So, the only question now is whether Madras Act VI of 1939 is in force or not and, if it is in force, it authorizes this Resolution. I submit that there is no force in the point of order.

" With regard to the other point raised by the hon. Member Sri Kolkebail, that we cannot levy a tax on petrol at all, I submit that is also not a valid point, because the old Provincial List and the present State List give power to the State Government to

impose a tax on sales. This is part of that general power and it is under that power that Madras Act VI of 1939 was passed even before.

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I never said that the previous laws did not continue. I actually said that they would continue. But if the previous law contains provisions which are against the Constitution, to the extent of the repugnancy, they are invalid. That is the fundamental point of the Constitution, which no one can get over. Therefore, when it is provided in the Constitution . . ."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" That is the very point which I answered. I am sorry I was brief in my remarks. I am always getting into difficulty trying to be brief. The point that I made was that there was nothing in the previous law which was inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution, because the Courts had decided that such delegated authority was lawful. It is on that basis that I wish to say that if a motion is adopted to-day giving delegated authority, it will be lawful."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I am not on the point of delegated legislation. It is true that if to-day we pass a law giving the power of delegation to the extent that this Legislature agrees to give, it will be valid. But my point is not that. This delegation is obtained under the old Act. Whatever laws continue, they may continue under the transitory provisions of the Constitution. But all the same, no tax shall be levied except under the authority of law. (Interruption). When a tax cannot be collected except by passing a legislation to that effect, it cannot be collected by passing a Resolution. Sir, in two or three sentences, I will tell you the reason behind it. A Bill has got to go through three stages in which the House can apply its mind."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The point of the Leader of the Opposition is that a Resolution is not a law? "

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" A Resolution is not a law under any stretch of imagination. There is no doubt about it. I hope, Sir, you will agree with me in that respect. The only question now is this. The Hon. the Chief Minister has stated that as the power is already existing, it will continue. My point is that after the Constitution has come into force, the Government cannot raise or collect a tax except under the authority of law. They cannot function under the delegation of an old Act. Although the Act may continue, the delegation is invalid. Therefore, the Government can raise a tax now only by means of a law. That is the fundamental basis of democratic structure and that provision has been copied from the American Constitution. The Hon. the Chief Minister and all the other hon. Members know that it is one of the fundamental basements upon which the structure of democracy is built and that the moment we give any relaxation to that principle, that moment we will be trying to take away the bricks from the

foundation of democracy. The relevant Article of the Constitution is very clear. Delegated authority by means of a Resolution is certainly repugnant to Article 265 of the Constitution. I submit the Government will have plenty of opportunity to come forward with a Bill. I am not saying that hereafter they cannot do it. They have got the right to raise taxes. But let them do it in the manner provided in the Constitution."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, since the Hon. the Chief Minister raised an important point with regard to Article 372 of the Constitution, I would like to make my own submission so that the Chair may decide the question properly. Article 372 (1) simply states—

> 'Notwithstanding the repeal by this Constitution of the enactments referred to in article 395 but subject to the other provisions of this Constitution, all the law in force in the territory of India immediately before the commencement of this Constitution shall continue in force therein until altered or repealed or amended by a competent Legislature or other competent authority.'

Article 395 states—

> 'The Indian Independence Act, 1947, and the Government of India Act 1935, together with all enactments amending or supplementing the latter Act, but not including the Abolition of Privy Council Jurisdiction Act, 1949, are hereby repealed.'

I submit that Article 372 refers to certain provisions. But now with regard to taxation on motor spirit, the position is covered by Article 277 which states that any taxes, duties, cesses or fees which, immediately before the commencement of this Constitution, were being lawfully levied by the Government of any State . . . may . . . continue to be levied . . . (Interruption.) Therefore, the Government can get power to levy a tax on motor spirit only under Article 277 of the Constitution because although ' motor spirit ' comes under the Union List . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" The tax is on petrol. What is the item which, according to the hon. Gentleman, excludes completely our jurisdiction? "

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" In the State List, it will be seen . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" We have got the power to levy a sales tax. It is not necessary that every article should be mentioned in the State List for this purpose. A tax on the sale of goods can be levied, whether it is petrol or any other thing."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Under Article 277 of the Constitution, the State Government have got the power under the previous Act to levy a tax on petrol. That is valid and there is no question about it. Granting that it is valid, any action to enhance the tax must be taken only under the authority of a law and not under delegated power."

[31st July 1952

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I will draw one more point to the attention of the Chair. This question has been thoroughly examined and we have taken this step under the law after looking into all the points. The question now is this. Though the original Act has not been repealed because the existing laws are protected, does a certain part of it stand repealed? That is the point which has been raised. I submit it does not stand repealed even in part because even when the Parliament recently took up the question of restricting the powers of the States in respect of taxation, they provided expressly for preservation of the existing powers there and it was only future laws that they tried to interfere with. Otherwise, according to the general principle now enunciated, it would be wholly out of order. I submit, Sir, there is no doubt that Government have power to act under the old Act and bring forward a Resolution for approval of the House."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I thought the Hon. the Chief Minister was going to say something about the existing Ordinance *plus* this Resolution."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I thought it was not very important or difficult to understand. There is already a provision that as soon as the House approves of it, the Governor will have full authority to withdraw the Ordinance. It is not our intention to have a double tax. The Ordinance will be withdrawn the moment approval is given to this Resolution."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I want to know whether the Governor has got the power to withdraw it."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Yes, he has got the power."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Ordinance will automatically lapse. Now, the hon. Member Sri T. Viswanatham has raised a point of order. He says that this Resolution is *ultra vires*. In this connection, I hope the House or at any rate the hon. Member Sri Viswanatham will remember that on a former occasion I quoted the ruling of Mr. Abdur Rahim given in the Central Parliament. The proper authority to decide the question whether a legislation is *ultra vires* or not is the Court and not the Legislature."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, before you give your ruling, please allow me to say a few words of explanation."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Yes. Secondly, I must tell the House that in England when similar points of order are raised, the hon. Member concerned gives notice of it to the Speaker beforehand. The House will also remember that in England the Speaker is assisted by a Legal Adviser, namely, the King's Counsel. Here I have not got such a Legal Adviser. I must also tell the House that when the Government bring forward a motion, the Speaker has nothing to do with the effect of it. The proper forum to decide whether it is *ultra vires* or *intra vires* is the Court."

31st July 1952]

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I would like to say something about your final sentence, Sir. Apart from the functions of the Court, we have also got certain definite functions when we are conversant . . ."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition could have informed me beforehand about his intention to raise this point of order. In England the Members give previous notice to the Speaker in such cases."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, I did not want to take anybody by surprise. As the Hon. Minister was reading the motion, the idea occurred to me and I was looking up the books for authority. That is why I could not immediately spot the Article wherein it is said that a Resolution which is repugnant to the provisions of the Constitution, is, to the extent of repugnancy, void. I was not able to readily lay my fingers on the relevant provision, because I did not sit with the idea of raising a point of order. Only when the Hon. Minister was reading the motion, I could immediately see that we were going to do something wrong and, therefore, I could not come up to you beforehand.

" I am opposed to the extent that no tax can be collected by a resolution. It may be a resolution according to existing law or it may not be. Whatever it is, a resolution is not law. Let us not be a party to collect taxes by means of resolutions." 10-10 a.m.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" May I state one thing, Sir? It is just a fleeting idea which the hon. Leader of the Opposition has put forward before this House."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" It is a very permanent idea."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" We have examined this question. Our Legal Department has examined this question thoroughly and we have come to the conclusion that we are doing the right thing. Under these circumstances, it is for the Courts to say whether it is *ultra vires*."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I respectfully protest against the remark made by the Hon. Minister that I had a fleeting idea. It is not a fleeting idea. It is a permanent idea. A fleeting idea is different, it comes and goes. But mine persists. This idea came to me as the Hon. Minister was going on with his speech. It is a very correct thing. In spite of my not having a Legal Department, I am very certain that I am in the right."

(Sri P. Ramamurthi was seen rising up in his seat.)

MR. SPEAKER :—" I am not going to allow more time for this. I have already allowed enough time. I am now going to give my ruling. For the three reasons that I have already given, I rule that the point of order raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition is clearly out of order. Now, let us take up the resolution."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, I oppose this resolution for very many good reasons. We are opposed to any increase in taxes. I am not going into this bit or that bit of taxation for the present. Under the present circumstances, in the present economic conditions obtaining in the country, we are opposed to any new taxes or any increase in taxes which will affect the cost of living. The Hon. Chief Minister charged us the other day that we are opposed to any form of taxation. It is not correct. We are for certain taxes. But we are opposed to increase in taxes or the imposition of new taxes at this stage. I wish to submit to the hon. Members of this House that it is time we revised our entire taxa tion structure, whether it is land tax, commercial tax or any other. Commercial tax has become more and more important than the land taxes. The whole structure has changed from what it was very many years ago. I submit it would be very wrong for the Government that has come into existence after the first General Elections after Independence, to continue the taxation in a very haphazard manner. I want the Government to appoint a Taxation Enquiry Committee. You remember that the Finance Minister of the Central Government stated that the Government of India are planning to appoint a Taxation Enquiry Committee. That Committee may go into the taxes which are within the power of the Central Government. So far as we are concerned, we are greatly agitated over the present incidence of the land tax and the present uneven distribution of other taxes. This method of levying a surcharge of 2 annas on one thing and one anna on another thing is very haphazard. I want the Government to be more scientific. They can do it and arrive at scientific results, I mean fairly scientific results, only if they revised the entire taxation structure. Therefore, the Government must appoint an Enquiry Committee which must go into this question and also the question of even distribution of the incidence of taxation and arrive at proper conclusion. The taxes must be in relation to the enjoyment of lands and properties and profits derived therefrom. I ask the Government to take up the matter with the Central Government also and come forward with a comprehensive measure of taxation. I know they cannot do it just now.

" I know Government is run on the foundation of taxes. We are not against all taxation measures as a whole. We must first decide which articles can be taxed and who are the persons to be taxed. We are opposed in principle to the imposition of new taxes at the present time. A taxation enquiry committee must go into the economic conditions of the country and the people and it must go into so many other things and evolve a suitable taxation structure for this State. Although some Members on the other side may feel that they must support the Government, I am sure I am voicing the views of the entire population of this State, when I say that everybody is opposed to new taxes and increase in existing taxes at this stage."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I just want to make our stand clear on this point. Obviously, this is a tax on people who are users of motor-cars and it will naturally be thought that those people who can certainly afford to pay more taxes must be able to pay this tax. I agree to that proposition. But the whole question is this. The question before us to-day is that we cannot look at the taxation proposals in isolation from other consequences and circumstances. We must view these proposals taking into account also the revenue position and also the purposes for which the Government are going to spend or are spending those revenues. If it is a case where the Government want more taxes for the purpose of spending more money on nation-building departments, then certainly we will welcome any fresh taxes. We want taxes for such purposes and we welcome them. Such taxes, which fall on the richer classes, will certainly be welcomed by us. But, to-day, what are we seeing? What for do the Government want this money? The Chief Minister and the Government have been refusing to cut down expenditure, the heavy expenditure for administrative purposes. They refuse to cut down expenditure on the repressive administrative machinery of the State, viz., the Police Department. Having failed in our attempt to persuade the Government to cut down expenditure on these things, it is not correct on our part, and it is not correct on the part of the people to go on paying more and more taxes for enabling the Government to maintain a repressive police machinery which is directed against the interests of the people. I therefore oppose this resolution."

* SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, on behalf of the Party which I have the honour to represent on the floor of the House, I want to say that we are opposed to this taxation measure for the following reasons. The first reason is this. We have had no proper and adequate reply from the Council of Ministers on certain matters. For instance, the Ministry has not taken sufficient steps to enquire into the leakage of budget secrets. We want to dissociate ourselves from the remarks made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition when he said that he was opposed to all new taxes at present. We are not opposed to all increases in taxes or all new taxes. We would like to see the incidence of taxation fall on the rich. To that extent, I would like to dissociate my party from the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition. Nevertheless, we are opposed to this tax as we believe that it is a regressive measure. Already, we notice reports in newspapers that there is a slump in the motor-car industry and any tax on the motor-car trade and industry at the present moment may not yield very much.

" Therefore, the further increase in taxes on motor vehicles is likely to yield less in the form of revenue. I suggest that this increase in tax is regressive and the taxation proposal should be dropped. The whole question of taxation on motor vehicles is under 10-20 a.m.

review by the Central Government and we do not think that this is an opportune moment for the introduction of a tax of this nature."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" On a point of personal explanation, Sir, I did not say that I opposed new taxes at all times. I said that imposition of increased taxes might follow an enquiry into the present structure of taxation. I did not say that I was opposed to taxes for all time to come."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to the Opposition for giving me this opportunity to speak and explain the necessity for this tax. The necessity for taxation on its merits is really the necessity for further expenditure. The necessity for expenditure has been thoroughly explained in the Budget debate and various proposals were made in this House not only for capital expenditure, but for expenditure for the benefit of the people—for increase in production and the like—on the revenue account. It is, therefore, necessary, if Part II schemes are increased and be added to every year, to have a Part II scheme so to say for taxation also. It is necessary for that reason to tax.

" Then, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition said, and said very rightly, that he did not object to taxation as such. He said so because I am sure he expects to be in Government one day; he will have to levy taxes then and he does not want the then Opposition to put before him his present speeches. He has, therefore, admitted rightly that he is not opposed to taxation as such. May I, Sir, combine the very skilful speeches made by Mr. Anthoni Pillai, Mr. Ramamurthi and the Leader of the Opposition and say that they are not opposed to taxation as such but to taxation by the present Government? This is the fair and frank attitude they take up. They are opposed to any form of taxation by the present Government, whether it is on the poor or on the motor user or on the rich. Mr. Ramamurthi has explained—rather he has tried to explain—his position by saying that since Police expenditure is increasing, the 'repressive' expenditure is increasing, he wants to oppose every form of taxation proposed by this Government. That is also a frank position to take up. But it was Mr. Ramamurthi and his colleagues who wanted the constables' batta to be raised, their salaries to be raised and their allowances to be raised. (Applause from the Ministerialist benches.) I agree that there is distinction between the poor and the rich; I agree that there is distinction between the small and the big. And I agree that they are after the small. I know that that is their hunting ground. But we shall not allow that hunt to succeed. We may reform everything but it is necessary to tax even to run the present Government. The Leader of the Opposition said : 'Appoint a Taxation Enquiry Committee'. A very reasonable proposal. But I would submit to him a reasonable thing to remember, namely, that when the question of distribution of the financial resources of India as a

whole between the Centre and the States, to which active consideration is being now given, is decided, an Enquiry Committee will naturally follow. Meanwhile, are we to suspend everything now? We cannot do it. Even if I appoint a Taxation Enquiry Committee with the help of the Opposition, even on that Committee we will have to spend, and you will have to maintain the present administration together with that Committee, which, I am sure will take a pretty large slice of the resources of the State. We know how Committees work. Evidence will have to be taken. Vested interests will have to give evidence as to how they got on in the past and how they fare now. It will be a prolonged enquiry. I submit, therefore, that the present resolution should be approved by the House.

" The hon. Member, who spoke on behalf of the Socialist Party said what he has said, because he has necessarily to be on the defensive. Here is a Socialist leader opposing a tax on the rich people. He has to defend himself. Therefore, he tells us very wisely that the tax is not desirable from the economic point of view, from the point of view of public finance, as this may come under the law of diminishing returns and we may get less and less in course of time. Sir, this is what we also feared. I am grateful to him for that consideration. This is the reason why we put the increase at two annas. At present the rate is four annas and we would have put it greedily at eight annas but for this consideration. It is, therefore, limited to the extent to which it has been limited on account of the consideration pointed out by Mr. Anthoni Pillai.

" There are, I know quite a number of hon. Members on the other side who have a very tender corner for the rich people. But they do not exhibit it or confess it. Some of them have at any rate the dominant idea : ' Do not allow any taxes for this Government '. I submit, Sir, this is not fair. Let us go on with our present Government and try to improve it. Let us improve our taxation structure, both of us consulting each other, vis-a-vis the Centre and then it will be easy for us to readjust things in consultation with each other."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" On a point of personal explanation, Sir. It is not my view and I never said : ' Do not allow this Government to raise this tax '."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" You implied that."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" He says that that is the effect of what I said. That is not it, Sir. Our charge is that the Government have not properly looked into the expenditure and the revenue sides; our charge is that they have foreseen less income than they can get; our charge is that this taxation, even for the purposes for which it is required by the Chief Minister, is not necessary; to be precise, our charge is that they can get sixteen to eighteen crores of rupees by way of sales tax, whereas they have budgeted for only

fourteen and a half crores of rupees. Our charge is that when revenue is adequate, no fresh taxation should be resorted to. So, Sir, our charge is not that this Government should have no right to collect any taxes, but that there is no necessity for further taxation now. We have no tender heart for the rich man. I think, if I were in the position of the Chief Minister, I would first bring in a Bill which would tax only the rich man."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, in view of the expanded nature of the personal explanation of the Leader of the Opposition, let me say a few words, not as personal explanation, but in answer to what Mr. Viswanatham has said just now. The expenditure side has already been discussed in the House. Apart from the decision at the time when anything is discussed, we must proceed from step to step taking things for granted which have been approved. The expenditure has been approved when the Budget is passed. The question now is, how to meet the gap which is not a very little bit. I promise the Leader of the Opposition and all the Members on both sides of the House—because nobody likes taxes—that if we have really underestimated our returns and if next year we find that we have plenty of money from sales tax, especially from certain districts which have gone off too easily with reference to sales tax, we will certainly have that money. If there will be a surplus shown in the account next year, nobody is going to misappropriate it or allow it to be misappropriated. If surplus returns are shown, then there will be a wonderful piece of generosity from the Government which will be ruling then when the Budget is presented and they will say : 'We will give up this tax and that tax'. But to-day, as the Budget has been approved, it is not possible to renew arguments—and it is not right also—and say that this tax should not be allowed to be levied."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Do I understand that the duration of this Act is one year ?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Every year, taxes may be revised."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

'That the following notification made by the Governor of Madras under the first proviso to section 3 (1) of the Madras Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939 (Madras Act VI of 1939), be approved :—

NOTIFICATION.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 3 (1) of the Madras Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939 (Madras Act VI of 1939), the Governor of Madras hereby fixes six annas per gallon as the rate at which tax shall be levied under that Act on all retail sales of petrol, with effect on and from the date on which this notification is approved by a resolution of the Legislative Assembly.' "

The motion was carried.

(3) RULES COMMITTEE.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, I beg to move— 10-30 a.m.

' That a Committee consisting of the following Members be appointed to make suggestions for the amendment of the Madras Assembly Rules :—

1 *The Speaker.*
2 *,, Deputy Speaker.*
3 *Sri S. Ramaswami Naidu.*
4 *The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.*
5 *Sri T. Viswanatham.*
6 *Dr. K. B. Menon.*
7 *Sri K. Rajaram Naidu.*
8 *,, G. Latchanna.*
9 *,, V. Balakrishnan.*
10 *Janab K. Uppi.*
11 *Sri A. S. Sahajanandam.*
12 *,, T. Nagi Reddi.*
13 *The Hon. Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nayar.*
14 *Sri V. V. Ramasami.*
15 *,, K. Koti Reddi.*
16 *,, V. R. Nagarajan.*
17 *,, V. R. Krishna Ayyar.*
18 *,, N. Ramakrishna Ayyar.' "*

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' That a Committee consisting of the following Members be appointed to make suggestions for the amendment of the Madras Assembly Rules :—

1 The Speaker.
2 ,, Deputy Speaker.
3 Sri S. Ramaswami Naidu.
4 The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
5 Sri T. Viswanatham.
6 Dr. K. B. Menon.
7 Sri K. Rajaram Naidu.
8 ,, G. Latchanna.
9 ,, V. Balakrishnan.
10 Janab K. Uppi.
11 Sri A. S. Sahajanandam.
12 ,, T. Nagi Reddi.
13 The Hon. Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nayar.
14 Sri V. V. Ramasami.

[Mr. Speaker] [31st July 1952

15 Sri K. Koti Reddi.
16 ,, V. R. Nagarajan.
17 ,, V. R. Krishna Ayyar.
18 ,, N. Ramakrishna Ayyar.' "

The motion was carried.

(4) AMENDMENT TO SCHEDULE IV TO THE MADRAS CITY MUNICIPAL ACT, 1919.

* THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—" Sir, I beg to move—

'*That the following draft of a rule proposed to be made by the Governor of Madras in exercise of the powers conferred by section 347 of the Madras City Municipal Act,* 1919 *(Madras Act IV of* 1919*), altering Schedule IV to that Act be approved :—*

DRAFT RULE.

In the said schedule to rule 14 *the following paragraph shall be added, namely :—*

"*No business shall be transacted at any meeting of the Taxation Appeals Committee unless the Chairman and at least one other member of the Committee are present. If the Chairman and one other member present are divided in opinion as to the decision to be given on any appeal, the appeal shall be decided at a meeting of the Committee attended by all the three members. All appeals coming up before the Committee at a meeting when all the three members are present, shall be decided according to the opinion of the majority of the members. In the event of disagreement among all the three members, the Chairman shall endeavour to bring about agreement among themselves or between any two of them over a specific proposal, failing which the opinion of the Chairman shall prevail.*" '

" Sir, while moving this I wish to explain the necessity for the amendment. The Taxation Appeals Committee of the Corporation of Madras consists of three members two of whom are elected by the Corporation of Madras and one is appointed by the Government who is also its Chairman. Under rule 14 under Schedule IV to the Madras City Municipal Act, 1919 the orders passed by the Commissioner, Corporation of Madras, in respect of tax assessment are heard by the Taxation Appeals Committee. As the quorum for the Appeals Committee is not prescribed under the rules it has been usual for the Committee to hear and decide the appeals with all the three members or with one member and the Chairman or even with the Chairman alone sitting. In certain appeals filed in his court, the Chief Judge of the Court of Small Causes, Madras

City, observed that the decision of the Taxation Appeals Committee will not be valid unless all the three members of the Committee hear and decide appeals. As the elected members of the Committee are honorary members they cannot be expected to attend every meeting of the Committee and if their attendance at every meeting is insisted upon, the taxation appeals cannot be disposed of promptly. It is therefore found necessary to amend rule 14 under Schedule IV to the Madras City Municipal Act, 1919, fixing the quorum for meetings of the Taxation Appeals Committee as two members including the Chairman and providing that when there is no unanimity among the two members present, the appeals will be decided at a meeting of the committee attended by all the three members and that appeals coming up before a meeting of all the three members will be decided by a majority of members. In the event of disagreement among all the three members the proposal is that the Chairman will endeavour to bring about an agreement among themselves or between any two of them over a specific proposal, failing which, the opinion of the Chairman shall prevail."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The motion is—

' That the following draft of a rule proposed to be made by the Governor of Madras in exercise of the powers conferred by section 347 of the Madras City Municipal Act, 1919 (Madras Act IV of 1919), altering Schedule IV to that Act be approved :—

DRAFT RULE.

In the said schedule to rule 14 the following paragraph shall be added, namely :—

" No business shall be transacted at any meeting of the Taxation Appeals Committee unless the Chairman and at least one other member of the Committee are present. If the Chairman and one other member present are divided in opinion as to the decision to be given on any appeal, the appeal shall be decided at a meeting of the Committee attended by all the three members. All appeals coming up before the Committee at a meeting when all the three members are present, shall be decided according to the opinion of the majority of the members. In the event of disagreement among all the three members, the Chairman shall endeavour to bring about agreement among themselves or between any two or them over a specific proposal, failing which the opinion of the Chairman shall prevail." "

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, it is a simple motion and normally nobody would have expected that we on this side of the House would have much to say on this. I would however like to point out that the resolution only indicates the mentality of the Government, the understanding of the Government with regard to municipal administration. Already the powers of municipal administrations have been reduced to such an extent that even in respect of taxation measures passed by the local bodies, provision is made by the Government for the appointment of an outsider, the Government nominee, for the administration of those measures. In

this case the Chairman is appointed by the Government. I am opposed to this interference though it is altogether a different matter.

"In this particular resolution the Government say that no appeal shall be decided unless the Chairman and somebody else are present. Why not the Government state that the quorum of that body shall be two whether the Chairman chooses to attend the meeting or not. Any two of the three members should certainly constitute a quorum and these two can decide the appeals. Why give special power to the Chairman? It might be said : 'The Government have appointed him and he will make it a point to attend the meeting'. But I ask why not state it specifically? The Chairman is given overriding powers over the other members. A special position is given to him in the Committee. The Government should hereafter at least think of giving greater autonomous powers to the local bodies. The Hon. Chief Minister declared on the floor of this House that when the Constitution is amended greater powers must be given to the States. Why should not this Government apply that same principle and give more powers to the local bodies, municipalities and others? Why go and interfere in their affairs at every stage? The desire to give more power to these bodies must prevail when Government bring forward such amendments. They should change their outlook in regard to municipal administration. This amendment which Government have moved only indicates that the old outlook continues. That must go."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Sir, my hon. Friend Mr. Ramamurthi has offered some remarks on the motion moved by the Hon. Minister for Local Administration, and I agree entirely with the remarks made by him. I will add one more for the consideration of the Hon. Minister if it is considered democratic. In the event of there being no unanimity of opinion among all the three members present in the Committee the Hon. Minister was pleased to say that the Chairman will endeavour to make one of the members to consent to his view and that view will be final. In case all the three disagree, the decision of the Chairman shall be final. This is what the Hon. Minister said. This is dictatorial and not democratic in principle, because the Chairman of the Committee is after all a paid servant of the Government. I am not against the present Chairman who is working there in the Corporation. I am only explaining the matter on general terms, and not on the basis of personalities. I suggest, when there is disagreement among the three, it should not be the privilege of the Chairman to have his view carried through in spite of the fact that two disagree with 10.40 a.m. him. It should be finally referred to the Council which is a bigger authority and which consists of more democratic elements and whose decisions shall be final. But the Government may say—it is also evident from the amendment—that it will be a tedious procedure to refer every matter to the Council and it will not be in the interests of the people also as it will involve inordinate delay in the disposal. Even then I reiterate my point, because when a person

31st July 1952] [Sri K. Vinayakam]

appeals to the Taxation Appeals Committee, he will have to wait at least for a period of three to four months before a final decision is reached by the Taxation Appeals Committee, and it does not matter if he is made to wait for one or two weeks more for a decision to be reached in the open session of the Council. I have also consulted my friends Mr. Anthony Pillai and Mr. Pakkirisami Pillai who also represent the Council and they are of the same view. Therefore, I request the Government to consider my suggestion and if it is incorporated in the amendment, we will welcome this amendment.''

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—'' Sir, I want to say a few words merely by way of intervention and not by way of reply. I beg of the hon. Members who have great experience of Corporation and municipal affairs, to consider the matter from a practical and administrative point of view. This tribunal is to dispose of rupees, annas, pies of taxation, and an appeal is provided, and this appeal is the subject-matter of the discussion now. It is a ' yes ' or ' no ', whether it is Rs. 20 or Rs. 15 or Rs. 13, and when there is a difference of opinion they found it impossible to resolve the difference by a majority or minority vote; hence all this complicated provision; it does not come up suddenly; it has come after a long trial and by a request from some of the active members of the Corporation; some solution has to be found. Now, I am appealing to those who are here as Legislators that they should forget their personalities as Corporation members, and use their experience and come to a conclusion on this very delicate and difficult question. All Corporation members are elected members and they are always on the alert to plead for their constituents and they have to. At the same time, this Three-Man Committee should give a decision which is necessary and just. The Committee must decide it without fear or favour. The amendment that has been moved by the Hon. Minister for Local Administration may be tried, and it will relieve the members to a certain extent of their difficulties and embarrassments; if it does not succeed and if there is anything wrong, we can again change it. I submit, therefore, with all deference to the more experienced members here about the Corporation affairs, that this step is fair and this is a proposal resulting from considerable experience; let us accept this tentatively.

'' Regarding the other proposal made by the hon. Member Mr. P. Ramamurthi that even two members should sit down and carry on the business without the knowledge of the Chairman, I should say that an outsider has been specifically appointed as Chairman to judge the facts and decide the issue, and it will be no use giving the Corporation the right to meet and dispose it of by majority. It is impossible for a large Council to dispose of an appeal whether the tax should be Rs. 10, Rs. 15 or Rs. 20. I therefore submit that the amendment may be accepted.''

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—'' By way of personal explanation, Sir. I believe, Sir, the Hon. Chief Minister has conceded my

view. But, in this measure I am putting in more democratic spirit. The Government's view was to limit the issue at the stage of the Chairman. I said that the matter could go to the Council which is more democratic. Let it not be the rule of one man or at least two men. Instead let there be the rule of at least 50 members.''

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—'' Sir, I thought I had dealt with the matter. I must again explain. If it should go to the Council whether the amount is Rs. 20 or Rs. 15 or Rs. 13 how can the Council decide it? Even there the same difficulty will arise. When a small body of three cannot decide, how can a numerical majority in a larger body dispose of the rupees, annas, pies question? ''

* SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI :—'' Mr. Speaker, Sir, the central problem is not the problem of procedure. It is the question of deciding as to whether a particular re-assessment of a property tax is fair or not. We know from experience that the tendency is to re-assess the tax not on a scientific basis, but to give an arbitrary decree. Of course, there is also no scientific basis as to how the reassessment should be reduced. Therefore, if a procedure is laid down as to the manner and the ground on which there should be reassessment, the decisions given by the Taxation Appeals Committee would be to some extent reasonable. At present the Taxation Appeals Committee is merely a buffer between the taxation authority and the poor tax-payer. Unless some specific procedure is laid down as to how and to what extent there should be reassessment, no scientific assessment of taxation is possible.''

* SRI N. GOPALA MENON :—'' Sir, I would like to explain briefly the manner in which the properties in Madras City are taxed. One hon. Member said that the matter might go before the whole Council, so that the assessee may have the benefit of the opinion of majority of the Council. The position is this. Ordinarily the assessor first starts the game of assessing the property; then it goes to the Commissioner to whom the assessee has got a right of appeal and when the Commissioner finally assesses the property, it goes to the Taxation Appeals Committee presided over by a Government official. The present incumbent is a Corporation man promoted as Government official and the other two in the Committee are members of the Corporation Council. Anybody who is dissatisfied with the decision of the Taxation Appeals Committee can by a petition go to the Chief Court of Small Causes and agitate the matter over again. Therefore on the question of taxation, every reasonable chance is provided for the assessee to take up the matter right up to the court. Here the amendment moved by the Hon. Minister for Local Administration seeks to modify the existing rule. Ordinarily in this Committee the Chairman is the person who has the last word and the members are without any power except that of persuasion. In the Taxation Appeals Committee the present amendment seeks to reinforce the authority of

the Chairman. If there is a difference of opinion between the Chairman and one other member, the amendment proposes that the Chairman shall use all arts of persuasion against the other member, and if he does not succeed, then the Chairman's opinion shall prevail. Sir, if we give power to the persons who constitute the Tribunal, it must be an equal power as in a Judicial Tribunal where, if there are two judges sitting and if both of them differ, the *status quo* ante will prevail.

" It would not be correct to confer such large powers on the presiding authority. Of course I know that in judicial tribunals when there is a difference of opinion, the opinion of the senior judge prevails. But in a democratic assembly and in a democratic tribunal, every person who constitutes the tribunal must have equal powers and equal authority. I know that in the Taxation Appeals Committee previously there was no outside person presiding over the tribunal. It was all members of the City Council. After all, it is a body which ought to know its own resources and suggest taxation suitably. It ought to know what taxes are to be levied. After all those members of the Taxation Appeals Committee are also persons who know their responsibility. I therefore sincerely believe that there is absolutely no need for this Government official to sit in a democratic body like the Taxation Appeals Committee. All the three members of the Taxation Appeals Committee as it was originally constituted were members of the City Council. It also jars a little against democratic ideas, if a person who is not a member of the City Council were to sit in judgment in the Taxation Appeals Committee over the others. After all he is not an elected member but an extraneous person, viz., a Government official appointed by the Government.

10-50 a.m.

" All the same, I think the amendment is necessary because the courts have held or at any rate likely to hold, that if a committee is constituted by three people, then their judgment will be valid only if all the three members attend the meeting. At present as the two members are honorary members, they cannot be compelled to be present at all meetings. With a view to remove the legal defect and evolve a correct procedure, the Hon. Minister has brought this amendment, viz., that there shall be two members and a Chairman and in case of a difference of opinion among them, the opinion of the Chairman shall prevail, so that it may act as the final word."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, some of the arguments advanced by the member who has just preceded me are arguments with which I am in entire agreement. But I am not in agreement with the conclusion arrived at from his arguments. I accept his argument that Government servants have no place in the Taxation Appeals Committee. The conclusion arrived at viz., that the Government are correct in having brought forward the amendment, is a statement which I strongly oppose.

" Sir, the Hon. Chief Minister by way of intervention, had said that members of the City Council are soft-hearted, that they owe a duty to please their constituencies and therefore they are not likely

to revise the taxes very favourably to the Corporation and enable the Corporation to get more revenues. I submit, Sir, that propositions of that type may be more reasonably advanced against that Taxation Appeal Committee wherein the Government are ushering in a Government official drawing a salary of Rs. 500 or more a month, to be the Chairman and to act as the final authority in taxation appeals wherein revenues worth about a crore to the Corporation are involved. In the opinion of the Government, it seems that non-officials are likely to be very soft-hearted. Time and again the Hon. Chief Minister comes here on the floor of this House and defends the Government servants by saying that they are scrupulously honest, diligent in their work, possess integrity and are above any kind of suspicion. On the other hand, whenever there is an opportunity, he steps in and says a word or two about the soft-heartedness of the non-officials.

"Sir, I cannot agree to the spirit of the approach to the whole question. In the mufassal also, we have got this problem. When it is said that non-officials are soft, can it not be said that some members of the Government also become soft at times, Sir? Even the highest paid Government servant becomes soft at certain times, when he has to exercise human considerations. When such is the case, how can it be said that non-officials alone cannot be expected to work with integrity? I demur to such a statement with all the vehemence at my command. When we condemn the non-officials, we are condemning ourselves.

"I submit, Sir, I have also got some experience in Municipal administration. There also we have these Taxation Appeals Sub-Committees with authority delegated by the Council. Nowhere has it been shown during these 30 or 40 years, that those people functioning in the Municipalities or in the Taxation Appeals Committees had been soft-hearted. As far as I have seen and as the facts reveal, it has been found that the non-officials are even more strict than the Government officials in the matter of collecting taxes. Whenever a member of a Municipality sits on the taxation side, he feels as though he is running the administration himself. He never lets a single pie of tax escape. In the matter of collecting taxes he is more strict than the Hon. Chief Minister himself.

"Sir, I have had experience for four years in this line. I can certify that there was not a single non-official who decided these cases with a soft heart. I want the Hon. Chief Minister not to give the non-officials that kind of reproach. I submit, Sir, that the provision for appointing a Government official drawing a salary of Rs. 500, on the Committee and making his voice the final one, is against the very spirit of the Constitution which we are trying to work. When I first saw the amendment, I did not pay much attention to it. But when I found that the Chairman is a Government official and not an elected member of the Corporation, I found I was mistaken. I submit, Sir, that such a provision is against all tenets of democracy. I never expected that Sri Sankara Reddi, a

31st July 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

valiant fighter of the people as he is, but one who has got the misfortune, so to say, to be on the Government side now, would ever come forward with an amendment like this. On the other hand he can bring in an alternative amendment giving complete powers to the City Council by saying that members of the Corporation alone can elect a sub-committee to look into the appeals. That would have been more civilised. After all, Sir, these elected members are all Indians. They are not foreigners coming from Iceland, Newfoundland or Great Britain, who are strangers to us. What the Government officials are able to do, surely the non-officials can do. This amendment clearly shows that the Government are not going on the right path of democracy. Hon. Members may excuse me for saying so. But I am obliged to say so. They want to give a petty Government servant varied powers to have the final say over the elected members of the Corporation. I strongly oppose this. I appeal to those in the Congress benches also, who might have come by now to understand the position clearly after listening to the discussion, to realise one point. If we allow the Government to proceed with this amendment, then it will be a forerunner of worse measures giving more and more executive powers to the Government in a field which is not theirs. I appeal to all those who are in the Congress ranks, to all those who are interested in the democratic set-up of our administration, and lastly to all those who are anxious that our hands should not be unnecessarily fettered by Government, to oppose this amendment.

" Not only that; I want that hon. Members on the Congress side should be saved from an embarrassing position. I ask the Hon. Minister for Local Administration to withdraw this. If he does not, I appeal to Members on the Government side not to vote against their own conviction, on party lines.' "

* THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is suggested by this small change to the rule that the Government want to take away the power of the Corporation or of the Appeals Committee. I submit that it is not correct. On the other hand, on account of the objection raised by the Judge and with a view to make the Appeals Committee more democratic, this change has become necessary. Hitherto, as I have already submitted, in the absence of the other two members, the Chairman alone would sit and decide the appeals. Now this change in the rule makes it incumbent on the Chairman to bring about agreement among the three members, or at least two of them. Only in case where there is no agreement, the Chairman can decide. In all democratic bodies, the presiding officer or chairman has got such power. (An hon. Member : ' But he is a paid officer here.') May be; but he has to do things according to the Act. He has no casting vote, and there must be some finality somewhere. And if anything goes wrong, surely the courts are there to decide on appeal. 11a.m.

" A suggestion has been made that appeals may lie to the Council against the decisions of the Appeals Committee, even as appeals lie to

municipal councils against decisions of the sub-committees. We cannot compare small municipalities and panchayats with a huge Corporation. I feel that the Corporation Council which is a huge body cannot be sitting over these small trifling appeals from day to-day. Sir, I have nothing more to add to what I have already said. This is a small amendment to remove certain administrative difficulties. I commend the amendment to the approval of the House.''

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—'' Mr. Speaker, Sir . . .''

MR. SPEAKER :—'' I am not going to allow the hon. Member to make a second speech. Is it a personal explanation?''

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—'' Yes, Sir; while winding up his speech on the motion, the Hon. Minister stated that the case of the Corporation was quite different from the case of small panchayats and municipalities. My submission is that what is democratic in the panchayats and municipalities must continue to be democratic even in a big Corporation.''

MR. SPEAKER :—'' It is not a personal explanation.

'' I now put the motion of the Hon. Sri Sankara Reddi to the vote of the House. The question is—

'That the following draft of a rule proposed to be made by the Governor of Madras in exercise of the powers conferred by section 347 of the Madras City Municipal Act, 1919 (Madras Act IV of 1919), altering Schedule IV to that Act be approved :—

DRAFT RULE.

In the said schedule to rule 14 the following paragraph shall be added, namely :—

'' No business shall be transacted at any meeting of the Taxation Appeals Committee unless the Chairman and at least one other member of the Committee are present. If the Chairman and one other member present are divided in opinion as to the decision to be given on any appeal, the appeal shall be decided at a meeting of the Committee attended by all the three members. All appeals coming up before the Committee at a meeting when all the three members are present, shall be decided according to the opinion of the majority of the members. In the event of disagreement among all the three members, the Chairman shall endeavour to bring about agreement among themselves or between any two of them over a specific proposal, failing which the opinion of the Chairman shall prevail.'' ' ''

The motion was carried.

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILLS.

(1) THE MADRAS PROHIBITION (AMENDMENT) BILL, [a] 1952.

THE HON. SRI V. C. PALANISWAMI GOUNDAR :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg leave of the House to introduce the Madras Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952. It is a Bill for the levy of a tax on sales of foreign liquor."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Anybody objecting to it? (After a pause.) I put this to the vote of the House.

" The question is that the Hon. Sri V. C. Palaniswami Goundar be granted leave to introduce the Madras Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952."

The motion was carried and leave was granted.

THE HON. SRI V. C. PALANISWAMI GOUNDAR :—" Sir, I introduce the Bill."

(2) THE MADRAS PAYMENT OF SALARIES AND REMOVAL OF DISQUALIFICATIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, [b] 1952.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I introduce the Madras Payment of Salaries and Removal of Disqualifications (Amendment) Bill, 1952, and move—

' *That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.*'

" This is a very simple measure. Sir, the Payment of Salaries and Removal of Disqualifications Act contemplated only elected Members of this House. In Article 333 of the Constitution it is provided that in the case of the Anglo-Indian community, the Governor has the power to nominate a person, if there is no elected representative of that community in the Assembly. Consequently, a member belonging to that community has been nominated by the Governor to this House. Under the Payment of Salaries and Removal of Disqualifications Act, there is no provision for payment of salary to this Member. Therefore, this small amendment to the existing Act is proposed. I do not think, Sir, there is likely to be any controversy over this measure. Sir, I move."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Motion moved—

' That the Madras Payment of Salaries and Removal of Disqualifications (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.' "

The motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I shall now take up the Bill clause by clause.

[a] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 6th August 1952.

[b] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 21st July 1952.

[Mr. Speaker] [31st July 1952

" The question is that the Preamble and clauses 1 and 2 do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was carried.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, I move—

' That the Bill be passed into law.' "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' That the Madras Payment of Salaries and Removal of Disqualifications (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.' "

The motion was carried and the Bill was passed into law.

(3) THE MADRAS STAGE CARRIAGES (SURCHARGE) BILL, 1952.[a]

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, I beg to move—

' That the Madras Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 4 of 1952), be referred to a Select Committee, consisting of the following Members :—

1. *The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam*
2. *,, Dr. U. Krishna Rao.*
3. *Sri K. Rajaram.*
4. *,, A. M. Sambandam.*
5. *,, S. Panchaksharam.*
6. *,, D. Dasaratharamaiah Naidu.*
7. *,, N. Rajagopal.*
8. *,, B. Vaikunta Baliga.*
9. *,, H. M. Jagannatham.*
10. *,, A. Balarama Reddy.*
11. *,, I. K. Subramania Pillai.*
12. *Janab K. M. Seethi.*
13. *Dr. K. B. Menon.*
14. *Sri P. Thimma Reddi.*
15. *,, M. Rajeswara Rao.*
16. *,, T. Viswanatham.*
17. *,, T. C. Narayana Nambiar.*
18. *,, K. P. Gopalan.*
19. *,, M. Venugopala Gounder.*
20. *,, P. B. K. Rajachidambaram.*
21. *,, P. Ratnaswami Pillai.*
22. *,, S. T. Adityan.*
23. *,, S. Ramalingam.*
24. *,, D. Dasarathan.*
25. *,, Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu.*

[a] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 30th June 1952.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

31st July 1952] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

" Sir, in moving this motion, I wish to bring to the notice of hon. Members that the Bill intends to enable the levy of a surcharge on fares paid by the bus passengers. Sir, item No. 56 of the State List relates to ' Taxes on passengers carried by road '. So, it is a tax exclusively within the jurisdiction of this House. As far as mechanically-propelled vehicles as such are concerned, they come under item 35 of the Concurrent List. So, if it is a case where tax has to be levied on the vehicles as such, it will come under the Concurrent List and the concurrence of the Central Government will have to be obtained; but as far as this Bill is concerned, it deals only with a tax on passengers carried on the road, and it is exclusively a State subject. There is thus no need for consultation with or the concurrence of the Central Government in this case. 11-10 a.m.

" Sir, it has been stated that this Bill is an attempt to tax the poor people who are using these buses. I should like to examine this statement. So far as mechanically-propelled vehicles are concerned, there is the railway and there are motor cars. Under the head ' motor cars ' you have the stage carriages and the ordinary motor cars owned by private individuals. As regards private cars, there are about 20,000 of them now in our State and 20,000 families are thus using their own private cars. The other members of the public have to use some other form of motor transport. And except where people go in a friend's car, the majority of the people use only the stage carriages wherever they have to use a mechanically-propelled vehicle, and wherever the railway train is not available to them.

" As regards the statement that it is only the poor people who use the buses, I must respectfully submit that it is not the poor people alone but all people except those who have cars of their own, who number about 20,000, use the buses. I am quite certain that even rich people use the buses especially in the rural parts. If we only analyse the categories of people who use the stage carriages, we find that the merchant classes who are moving about from one place to another mostly use these buses. As regards their capacity to pay, I respectfully submit that, comparatively speaking, they have got a greater capacity to pay taxes than others. As I said, the merchant classes are the main users of these buses in the rural areas and also in the urban areas. Another class of persons who take to these buses is the litigant public who go to courts very often from the rural parts. I submit again that they also can afford to pay a little by way of surcharge. As regards other sections of the people, I may say that the producer who wants to go to a near-by shandy for the purpose of disposing of his article, does not use the bus; he uses the country-cart. Therefore, this surcharge is not likely to touch him at all. There is yet another class of people which is on the increase, viz., the people who go to the towns from the rural parts for the purpose of seeing cinemas and for other entertainments. I am sure that class also won't grudge paying a little more. Again, if you take the agricultural labourer or other labourer in the rural parts, you will find

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [31st July 1952

that the occasion for him to go in the bus is very rare; perhaps an occasion will arise once a year or twice a year. Ordinarily, these labourers have no occasion to travel in a bus. If they have to go a short distance, they have still got the habit of walking it up, and it gives them good health also; even if it is four or five miles, they do not mind walking. It is a good habit. Therefore, I submit that it is a fact that the poor labourers and the poorest class of people are not at all using the buses; and even if they use, it is only occasionally once or twice a year that they do so. I myself come from a village and I am acquainted with village life. Even now, I go and live in the village, and I can therefore claim to know the villagers and their modes of life. I can therefore say with certain authority that it is only the richer classes in the villages who take to the buses, and the other classes of people either travel by bullock-cart or take to walking. In these circumstances, to say that when we levy a surcharge on the stage carriages, we will be hitting the poor most, is, I respectfully submit, not absolutely correct. We have taken this item of revenue as one to which, not the people of the lowest strata of society, economically, but the richer people, will be contributing, i.e., such people as can afford to bear the burden of the tax.

" One other point we have to take into consideration is whether the entire burden will be passed on to the passengers. My respectful submission is that it will not be passed on to them, for this reason: that even now although the maximum rate is 7 pies per mile, it is not levied because the operators feel that if they levy 7 pies, the passengers will take to other forms of transport. That is why, in my humble opinion, the rate has been restricted to 5 pies in some cases, while in the majority of cases it is restricted to six pies. And so, even if the maximum is increased to eight pies, I am sure the bus-owners will not increase the existing rates.

" On the other hand they would prefer to carry greater number of passengers and pay this surcharge from out of their own earnings. It will be possible for the bus-owners to pay a certain amount of their earnings towards this tax. My respectful submission is that the entire burden of this taxation will not be passed on to the passengers. Under these circumstances, this measure cannot be said to be a measure which would affect poor people.

" Some hon. Members asked why we chose this form of taxation and suggested that we could increase the overall taxation of Rs. 30 per seat per quarter to Rs. 40 or Rs. 50. If we adopt the suggestion, we will be taxing not only buses running on profitable or economic routes but also buses running on very uneconomic routes. A uniform rise in tax will greatly affect the buses on uneconomic routes, especially the small fleet owners, persons owning three or four buses. Therefore the present proposal is an equitable proposal. The surcharge will be in proportion to the number of passengers and mileage and therefore the earnings of the buses. There is a very wide margin in the daily collections of various buses on the different routes. It varies from Rs. 70 to

31st July 1952] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

Rs. 225, depending on the availability of traffic and the mileage done by the vehicle. When there is such a wide margin in the daily earnings of buses, in my humble opinion a uniform increase of tax on all vehicles will not be equitable. It was for this reason that the taxation was proposed in the form of surcharge.

"There is a popular notion that the auctioning of bus routes and giving the right of plying buses to the highest bidder will fetch more revenue. I wish to point out the difficulty involved in this. It is not as if the running of buses can be started without any capital whatsoever. Each bus costs nearly Rs. 23,000 to Rs. 25,000. A man who wants to run a bus has to invest Rs. 25,000 on the vehicle alone. One will have to buy at least three or four vehicles to constitute an economic unit and for that he will have to spend at least a lakh of rupees. For attending to the maintenance and repair of buses, he should have a workshop or get himself attached to a workshop. Suppose we auction the 11-20 route for one year. If a person who takes the route for one year is a.m. thrown out at the end of that period, he will be almost ruined. Suppose the period of auction is two or three years. A bus will not have run its full life within three years. It can be run even after that period. A bus operator will be at a great disadvantage of being overbidden at the subsequent auction, and all his buses and workshop will become useless. The small operators will not be able to compete in the bid. All the big operators will combine, as was the case in respect of toddy shop before the advent of prohibition, bid for a small amount, have the monopoly and earn all the profits. When the suggestion was made, it looked as if it was very good. But when we examined its implications, we found that it was not a sound proposition and therefore had to give it up. The only alternative, without encroaching on the field of the Central Government, which would not hit the poor strata of people is the form of taxation proposed in this Bill.

"I know there are difficulties in the working of this Act. How are we to get the returns from each operator and how are we to fix the amount of surcharge payable in respect of each bus? That will be the main headache. We have taken the necessary powers. This may be examined in the Select Committee. In lieu of this surcharge, if we levy a tax per seat per mile per annum, we may get about the same amount, viz., Rs. 1,25,00,000. The calculation will be easier in that case. Some buses run 80 to 90 miles per day, and some buses run 150 miles. The tax will be in proportion to the mileage done by the bus. All these can be discussed in the Select Committee.

"Hon. Members may point out other difficulties in the Select Committee. It will be the endeavour of the Government to remove all the difficulties. When the Bill comes up before this House as modified by the Select Committee, I am sure all the difficulties will be removed and will be in a form which will be acceptable to the whole House. With that intention, I have moved the motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee."

[31st July 1952

MR. SPEAKER :—" Before we proceed further, I wish to point out to the Hon. Leader of the House a minor point of procedure. Under Rule 81 of the Assembly Rules, no Select Committee on a Bill shall, without the leave of the House, consist of more than fifteen members and no Select Committee shall, in any case, consist of more than 25 members. He must move a motion for obtaining the leave of the House since the Select Committee will have more than 15 members."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" The Leader of the Opposition gave me to understand that the maximum limit was 25. I am sorry I did not verify it from the rule. I move—

'*That under rule 81 of the Madras Assembly Rules, the leave of the House be granted to have 25 members on the Select Committee on the Madras Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill*, 1952.' "

The motion was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I will ask Mr. C. V. K. Rao to move his amendment. Then the motion as well as the amendment will be before the House."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" I am not moving my amendment. I would like to explain the reason for this."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Certainly I will give him an opportunity. Motion moved—

'That the Madras Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 4 of 1952), be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members :—

1. The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
2 ,, Dr. U. Krishna Rao.
3. Sri K. Rajaram.
4. ,, A. M. Sambandam.
5 ,, S. Panchaksharam.
6. ,, D. Dasaratharamaiah Naidu.
7. ,, N. Rajagopal.
8. ,, B. Vaikunta Baliga.
9. ,, H. M. Jagannatham.
10. ,, A. Balarama Reddy.
11. ,, I. K. Subramania Pillai.
12. Janab K. M. Seethi.
13. Dr. K. B. Menon.
14. Sri P. Thimma Reddi.
15. ,, M. Rajeswara Rao.
16. ,, T. Viswanatham.
17. ,, T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
18. ,, K. P. Gopalan.

31st July 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

19 Sri M. Venugopala Gounder.
20. ,, P. B. K. Rajachidambaram.
21. ,, P. Ratnaswami Pillai.
22. ,, S. T. Adityan.
23. ,, S. Ramalingam.
24. ,, D. Dasarathan.
25. ,, Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu.' "

Sri C. V. K. Rao :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Minister said that in levying this surcharge, he would not be taxing the poor and that he would be taxing only the rich people, litigants and cinema-going public. He also said that the money would not be coming from the bus travellers and that the bus operator would pay it. These two are contradictory statements. This is how the Government are trying to hoodwink the Members of this House to get more revenue somehow or other. According to the Statement of Objects and Reasons, this Bill has been brought forward in order to provide for an increase in the revenues of the State. I wish that the reasons now put forward by the Hon. Minister were incorporated in that statement. I beg to submit that this Bill is intended to tax the poor man, to rob him of his hard-earned pies.

" If the object of this Bill is to tax the bus passengers whoever they may be, why are the Government not going to tax the bus passengers in Madras City? If the object of this Bill is to get money from bus operators, why are they not taxing the Madras bus operators namely the State? The Government know full well that there will be a large volume of opposition in the City and that is why they do not want to tax the bus passengers of the City. What holds good for the Madras City, I submit, holds good for other places as well. If the bus operators in the Madras City, namely, the Government of Madras are not prepared to pay, it stands to reason that the bus operators in the mufassal also should not be made to pay.

" It is not the rich man who will be paying the tax while travelling in the bus. But the vast majority of the common men use this cheap means of transport, and they will have to pay the tax. Therefore, this is an unjust measure. Sir, some time back the Hon. the Chief Minister said, while speaking on Prohibition, that he did not want to rob the poor man by taxing his drink. He wanted to eliminate that tax altogether. But here is a very clear case of the Government's saying one thing and doing another. It is for political ends they bring forward Bills like this. They bring in any kind of argument to convince the public that this Bill is most harmless, and that it after all taxes only the bus operators and the rich people. They say that it does not tax the common man. I submit that this is cheating the public, if the word ' cheating ' is parliamentary. 11-30 a.m.

" I would like to explain how much money the poor man has got to pay. Bus is the only cheap means of transport for him.

[Sri C. V. K. Rao] [31st July 1952

If he has to travel 25 miles, he has got to pay at the moment ten annas. Under the provisions of this Bill, he will have to pay four annas more."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Only two annas more."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" Sir, this is not the way in which the Government should rob the poor man of his hard earned money. The Hon. Minister said that the poor man was not going to undertake long distance journeys, and that he travelled only short distances on foot. Therefore, he said the poor man would not pay any tax at all. The Hon. Minister said that rich men travelled long distances, and they had no cars. They will purchase cars only when they become Ministers. However, there are very rich landlords who use cars. They have taxis and other means of transport. To say that all people who travel in buses are rich is a contradiction in terms. This Bill is quite unwarranted and is unjust. This should be opposed. If the Government want more money, they should nationalize the large fleet of buses now owned by the bus operators. The Madras Government have made a profit from the nationalization of bus transport in the City. It is also stated that out of every 100 buses and lorries with permits, 25 buses and lorries are not paying any tax at all. The Government are not prepared to get the revenue that is due to them. They are giving a free hand to these rich people who purchase these buses and get the permits. The rich people illegally carry on their trade. If the Government are really sincere about getting money, they must get it from other sources and not tax the poor men. Therefore, Sir, I oppose the Bill."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have to announce to the House that we will have afternoon session to-day. We will meet at 2-30 and go on till 6 o'clock or till we complete the agenda, whichever is earlier."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, after hearing the speech of the Hon. the Finance Minister while introducing the Bill, one would have got the impression that when we agreed to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, we meant that we had the liberty to change a clause here and another clause there in regard to the manner of collecting the tax, etc., and that we had agreed to the basic principle underlying the levy of this tax. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I am sure, in his speech will make the position clear as to what exactly is the stand taken by the Opposition in this matter. Leaving apart the question that we are opposed to the basic principle underlying this taxation, I would like now to answer some of the points that have been raised and the assumptions made by the Hon. the Leader of the House, while he introduced this Bill. First of all, let us see what is the basic principle of taxation underlying this Bill. I would like to know from the Hon. the Finance Minister whether he understands elementary economics. I would like to ask him to realize what exactly is the economic situation in our country to-day. There is

31st July 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

a slump in the country and the purchasing power of the vast majority of the people is tremendously falling. There is a terrific slump. It is a very vicious circle, one aggravating the another. There is no way out. What does our Finance Minister propose to do to solve the slump and tackle the problems created by the slump? The only solution the Finance Minister can offer is to mop up the purchasing power of the people further so that the intensity of the slump may increase hundredfold. I would like to inform the Government that this will act as a boomerang on the Government themselves, and that this would lead to a further intensification of the economic crisis leading ultimately to a crash of our entire economy and to the bankruptcy of the State itself. Secondly, what is the basis of this tax? It was very cleverly stated that after all it was just an increase of one pie per mile. The total amount of revenue to be realized from this tax is about Rs. 2 crores per year. One of the Hon. Ministers speaking across the table told me that it was after all a question of taxing the people at the rate of 8 annas per head in the whole course of one year. I am here reminded of a certain story about Chettiyars. It is only a story, and I am not making any reflection upon any Member of this House or on the Hon. Member the Raja of Chettinad. The story is that the Chettiyars are, after all, taking interest only at the rate of one pie for every pie. Just like that story, it is stated here that after all it is only 8 annas that is being levied on an individual for a whole year. That is not the question. The question is what is the amount of taxation that the people of this country are already bearing, and whether any further increase in the tax burden they will be able to bear, or whether this tax will prove to be the last straw on the camel's back. I would like to point out that in this country the average taxation per head of the population works out to roughly Rs. 25. This includes the taxes that are levied by the Central Government also. The provincial taxes per head of the population work out to Rs. 12½ per year. Rs. 61 crores for a population of 4½ crores works out to roughly Rs. 12½ per head of the population. Leaving alone the educational cess and other cesses that are levied by the district boards and municipalities, the total taxes levied by the Central Government and the State Government work out roughly to Rs. 25 per head of the population.

" It may be said that Rs. 25 per head is, after all, not a big amount. But we have to take into account the average income of the people of this country. The *per capita* income of the people of this country, according to a survey conducted by a committee appointed by the Government of India recently and presided over by an eminent statistician, is hardly Rs. 65 per annum. This is perhaps the lowest figure of income in any part of the world. The people of this country are so very poor. They are already paying tax of Rs. 25 on this income. I would say that that is the highest incidence of taxation on the people, if we take into account the poverty of the country and the extreme misery that the people are already suffering from. Therefore, it is that I say 11-40 a.m.

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [31st July 1952

that the introduction of a levy of 8 annas per individual is going to prove to be the last straw that breaks the camel's back and people are going to fight against it.

" Secondly, the Hon. the Finance Minister was expatiating on what classes of the people are going to be affected by this levy. I was just feeling whether the Hon. Minister was going to say, ' There can be any amount of increase in the food prices. Rice can to-day sell not at Re. 1 or Re. 1-4-0 per measure but at Rs. 2 per measure because it is not the poor people alone that use rice. The rich men are also using rice and all sorts of people are using it. Therefore, why should there be any apprehension that the burden is going to fall only on the poor people? ' Sir, the question should not be looked at that way. It has got to be looked at from the point of view of the main incidence of taxation. It may be that certain big merchants or certain rich classes of people sometimes in their lives—for example, when their car goes out of order—use the bus transport. But regarding the question on what classes of people the incidence of taxation is going to fall mainly, I submit that the reasonings of the Hon. the Finance Minister cannot hold water. In this regard, the bus operators themselves are the best certifiers and not the Hon. the Finance Minister who goes to his village once in two or three years, perhaps for a holiday, because he has always been practising in Coimbatore. Therefore, he is not the person competent to give a certificate as to who are the people that use the bus transport very often. I submit the bus operators themselves know who are actually travelling by buses in the entire State. They have already stated that it is the common people that frequently travel by buses. When they talk of common people, they refer to poor people. After all, the overwhelming majority of the people of this country are poor people. The number of people who are rich can be counted on one's fingers. To-day the overwhelming majority of the people already being very poor, it is not fair to make an invidious distinction and say that only very poor sections of the people do not use the bus transport. The contention that the majority of the people who use the bus transport belong to the richer classes cannot hold water. It is an argument that has got to be refuted. Can the Hon. Minister deny that the majority of the middle class people have got to use the bus transport at some time or other? There are middle class people who are mostly users of the bus transport. Now, if we assume for the moment that certain sections of the lowest class of people do not use the bus transport, then it means that the incidence of taxation on the middle class people is not going to be at the rate of 8 annas per head but it is going to be much more than that. It means that the middle class people in our State will have to spend not less than about Rs. 40 per head by way of increased taxation. This is the way in which the Government expect to get money from the common people of this country. Sir, in 1926 or 1927 when Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel was leading the Bardoli Satyagraha Movement, he said that air alone was left untaxed by the British Government in this country. To-day I would like to ask the Government,

'Are you not following in the footsteps of the same British Government?' What is it that the Government are leaving untaxed now? They are levying a tax on every service that the common people of this country have got to resort to. They are greedy. The Hon. the Chief Minister always talks of greed while referring to the Opposition. I must submit that the most greedy element existing in this country is the Government of Madras. (Applause from the Opposition Benches.) There is nothing but greed exhibited in this Bill. Therefore, I say that the entire principle underlying this taxation Bill is repugnant to all accepted principles of public finance and taxation, and it must go lock, stock and barrel."

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am one of those who do not like the Bill. But as it is going to be referred to a Select Committee, it can be thoroughly discussed there. I must, however, say what I feel about the aims and objects expounded by the Hon. Minister. Sir, I think many hon. Members here will agree with me that if each Member could be given three or four bus routes, we would not want the monthly salary or daily allowance now paid to us. If we are given three or four bus routes, we will pay to the Government everything incidental to it, namely, licence fee and other things just as other bus-owners will pay. We will be happy then because we will be profiting not only ourselves but also others. I do not have the necessary capital to invest but I will have somebody else to invest the required capital. He will profit himself and also will be profiting me to the extent of three or four times my salary and allowances. When that is the position, there is no point in saying that the proprietors of buses or the bus route owners will be affected by this taxation. One of the progressive Members was saying this morning that the proprietors would be affected by this taxation. Not at all, Sir. I would like such hon. Members to note that they should not speak on the authority of news from books published but on the authority of news got from the people who are running the buses. Proprietors of buses will not at all be affected by this taxation. It is the passengers that will really be affected. In the existing rules relating to the running of buses there is a provision that if passengers travel for four miles or less, they will have to pay a minimum of four annas. I know that old people who cannot walk, when they get into buses, are forced to pay that four annas. In many a place and in many buses I have seen that."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" I would like to inform the hon. Member that nobody from this side of the House stated, while speaking on this Bill, that the proprietors would be affected. It is the Hon. the Finance Minister himself that stated it, as far as this Bill is concerned."

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI :—" I do not know if the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi was present when a progressive Member of this House belonging to the Socialist Party was speaking on this Bill. If the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi feels that his Party alone is progressive, then I have nothing to say in the matter."

[31st July 1952

* SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI :—" I do not know what the hon. Member is referring to. If he is referring to the question of the increase in the tax on petrol, I would like to repeat what I said, for his benefit, because it seems to have been misunderstood. I said, as a matter of general principle, we would like the incidence of taxation to fall on the rich. The people who use motor cars are normally rich and, therefore, I said that we would normally have no objection to an increase in the tax on petrol. In this particular case, I went on to say, there are grounds to believe that this tax is likely to be regressive. That is all I said. If the hon. Member misunderstood me, I am very sorry."

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI :—" I have understood the hon. Member very well. As the Hon. Sri Rajagopalachari said, not 6 annas or 8 annas but even 12 annas these proprietors could pay. If the tax that is now proposed will not fall on the poor people but will fall on the proprietors alone, I will say that even double or thrice the amount of the tax may be levied. Many of my relatives are bus proprietors and I know this business is profitable. So, it is the passengers that will be affected by this tax. The bus proprietors are already collecting from the passengers 8 pies and even 12 pies. We have been travellers and we know it. If this increase in tax is effected, they will collect from the passengers still more.

11-50 a.m. " There is the extra income from overloading buses in every route. Every bus-owner is making extra money every day and on every route. Only once in six months or one year, some of them are charged for overload. Many of them are left. These officers who are engaged on the work of detecting such overloads are only charging the ordinary, poor bus proprietors and are letting off the richer proprietors. Whatever it is, these proprietors are getting a lot of money and that is the point which I wish to stress in this connection. So, let us not be thinking that the bus-proprietors will be hard hit if they are taxed. It is the poor travelling public that will be hit.

" The policy advocated by our Party for a long number of years in the past is that these routes must be auctioned. I do not know why the Government have not yet thought it fit to do this. The Hon. Minister who moved this Bill said that it is not possible to auction these things. If this is not possible, where will be the possibility to do anything? At present shandy and markets are being auctioned in certain municipal and district board areas. Why don't you expect that the richer people in those places will join together and crush the ordinary poor men? The Government, I know, have never thought like that and have permitted such things to go on. Then, what about these fish ponds and other things? The Government have been auctioning those things and they never thought that it was bad. My opinion is that in auctioning, there will be facility even for the ordinary man to compete with the richer man. I know what these shandy contractors do. Of course some rich people take part in the auction along with the ordinary people. I may tell this House, these rich people can only purchase the poor contractor and

31st July 1952] [Sri P. Thimma Reddi]

not bid with him. I know what is taking place there. These rich men bid for a low amount and rebid it and share the general profit or they pay something to the other bidders and bid for a small amount and get the whole thing themselves. What is the harm in auctioning these bus routes? Is a bus-owner considered a poor man? The Hon. Minister himself has said that a bus will cost Rs. 20,000 to Rs. 25,000. In this poor country, can a man who possesses Rs. 20,000 to Rs. 25,000 be classified as a poor man? Even a man who has four to five thousand rupees is considered a rich man in his own sphere. When that is the case, these people can never be called rich. That is why I say that these big men, these big capitalists and these rich men should not be allowed to go on monopolising these routes. Others must also be given opportunities. The ordinary poor men also must have a chance in this matter. These routes must be auctioned so that everybody can have a say in the matter.

" Where is the need for a workshop for these people? There are many bus-owners, who are themselves drivers, conductors and workmen. They repair their own buses. They never go to workshops and pay heavy sums for getting their buses repaired. Even those who own one or two buses never go to workshops and they themselves repair their buses. In this manner, they do not incur much expenditure on maintaining their buses and thus they get enormous profit. I know of many cases where people have earned a lot through buses. In Rayalaseema, I know of two persons, who were bus drivers 20 years back. To-day, they have Rs. 30 to Rs. 40 lakhs each. There are many others who have become millionaires in this manner. I am mentioning all these things only to show that this bus business is not a mere profession, wherein one can find his simple living. It is not so. If only the Government can properly assess the profits earned by these bus proprietors in different routes, and if only they are able to tax them properly, the Government will be able to get a great amount. Let us not ruin these bus-owners and let us not make them insolvents. That is not my point. They are getting huge profits. Out of those profits, if the Government are able to extract the maximum money by way of taxes, then there will be no need for any other new taxation and there will be no need for any Select Committee to go into this Bill. There will be no need for any loan and there will be no need for getting any grant from the Central Government. By adopting the method suggested by me, the Government will be able to get Rs. 7 to Rs. 8 crores.

" In this connexion, I wish to make a reference to the removal of non-official elements from some of the transport authorities. Who is the Collector, who is the Superintendent and who are the various officers? Are they not our relatives, are they not our friends? I know many of them are the toys and pawns of influential politicians and other non-officials. When that is the case, how can the people expect complete ' High Court Justice ' in the matter of these bus routes? I have been carefully watching how these bus routes are granted. I know there are certain interests, certain

[Sri P. Thimma Reddi] [31st July 1952

very influential interests that are working in the matter of these bus routes. I know certain cases, where these routes have been allotted, but later on cancelled by Ministers. If anybody has any doubt in this matter, let him refer to the records of the Central Road Traffic Board. Then he will see how in the last five years, bus routes have been given to various people. It has become a scandalous history in the last five years. It has brought infamy for the Government. People began to term the Madras Government as a 'bus-route Government'. Many of us know this and how scandalous it has been. Are not some of the Members who are sitting here now and who were in the previous House also in the past, aware that there have been many discussions on this subject in the past? Have not reports about it appeared in newspapers? I know the whole history, the people in the district know the whole history. I have myself written to the authorities. Even now, more routes are not given. In the present House, I have put some questions relating to some incidents in this connexion and I got the reply that it was a fact that such and such thing took place in the past. I also wish to take this opportunity to mention that the many representations and protests submitted to the authorities in the past are missing in the Road Traffic Board office. What has happened to those things? Wherever more routes ought to have been opened, they have not been opened. The result was that only a few people monopolised all the bus routes."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—"With great respect to the hon. Member, I am afraid he is going off the mark and off the track also. We are now discussing the levy of a surcharge on bus fares. We are not now concerned with the Road Traffic Board and other things. We had sufficient opportunity to refer to these things during the buget discussion. I, therefore, respectfully request the hon. Member to confine his remarks within the scope of the Bill."

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI :—"Sir, I had to mention these things to the hon. Members of this House and to the Hon. Minister only to show that there was absolutely no necessity for levying this surcharge on the poor travelling public. I only suggest that even under the existing system, by an alternative arrangement, we can get greater income from the bus-owners for the State, and we need not think of levying a surcharge of one pie or increasing the fares to eight pies per mile. The bus proprietors will pay the tax. If anybody were to say that it cannot be done, then I disagree with them. My only plea is that we should not tax the poor passengers. That is why I say that we must discuss the whole thing thoroughly, and if we can reach an agreement with the bus proprietors, then it is well and good. I wish to emphasize that whatever we may do must not hit the poor travelling public. Bearing this point clearly in view, we must proceed with the consideration of this Bill. Sir, I only took this occasion to enlighten the hon. Members here as to how these bus routes are granted, as to how these bus-owners are reaping enormous profits, and as to

31st July 1952] [Sri P. Thimma Reddi]

how the State can get easily Rs. 7 to Rs. 8 crores by accepting my suggestion with regard to auctioning the routes and other matters. With these suggestions, I conclude my speech, Sir."

* DR. K. B. MENON :—" Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I do not feel that it is very necessary to make a long speech when the Bill is to be referred to a Select Committee. I rise to put a question or two to the Hon. the Minister for Finance for information, but before I do that, I would like to make a few remarks. 12 noon.

" The Hon. the Minister for Finance made a very ingenious effort to prove that the surcharge on bus fares will be paid by the rich. We have to be very careful when we use the word 'rich' in a country where purchases are made on the split pie. If the Minister would go and sit in a village grocery shop, he would see how purchases are made by the lower middle class on the split pie. I would remind hon. Members that there are only a few in the whole of India who pay income-tax. According to the United Nations' reports, not more than 700,000 people pay it in the whole of India, and if we come to South India, the number will be considerably less. The average income of an Indian is sixty-five rupees and if we come to South India, the average income is much less than this. When it comes to my district of Malabar, it is only half the income of Andhra or Tamilnad. When we remember all these facts, it is very difficult to accept that the tax now proposed—surcharge on the bus fares—is borne by the rich. When the Hon. the Minister made the statement that the poor man often prefers to walk or pick up a ride in a shaky, rickety bullock-cart, has he asked himself the question whether he does it out of free choice or whether he is compelled to do it by circumstances? I wonder whether he walks for his health or picks up the ride in the rickety cart because he likes to have a joy ride.

" I would like to make one other remark on the statement made by the Hon. the Minister for Finance that the bus-owners were willing to pay the surcharge. I have a very shrewd suspicion that the bus-owners have their own reasons for making this statement. I know how the buses are run. I know how accounts are kept. I know how little check there is by the Government on the collections that are made by the bus-owners. I have a very shrewd suspicion, as I said, why they are willing to pay this surcharge. They do not want any scrutiny of or check upon the income they get from the buses. They shed crocodile tears at the Bus-owners' Conference for the poor man. They complimented him; they offered him their goodwill. Why, they know their accounts are not scrutnized and so can increase their income by sympathizing with the poor man who uses the buses.

" With these remarks, I would request the Minister to tell me what the terms of reference for this Committee will be, whether the Committee will be qualified to make alternative proposals for taxation and whether the Committee will be permitted to discuss policies with regard to bus services."

(At this stage Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.)

[31st July 1952

MR. SPEAKER :—" I would like hon. Members to be very brief since the Bill will come before the Assembly again after it is reported upon by the Select Committee."

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, there are one or two points I wish to make. The Hon. the Minister for Finance was telling us that the fares, as they are, are rather low. Perhaps the present position is not known to him. As a matter of fact, I know the position well. If one wants to go from Madras to Nellore, one pays the fare for that distance. But there are a number of stations in between, Gudur, Naidupet, Sulurpet and so on. If one takes a ticket for Nellore only, one will be taken into the bus. So much so, if a man wants to go to Gudur, he has to pay the fare for Nellore. This is the case with almost all the routes. Unless we pay the fare for the terminus, we do not get a seat. Consequently, we pay not seven pies per mile but something like five annas per mile. The minimum is five annas per mile. Even if you travel one mile, you will have to pay five annas and still there is a terrible row for getting a seat. While the Minister says, it is seven pies per mile, in actual practice five annas is collected, not collected, but passengers are fleeced to pay. I know, as a matter of fact, many of the bus-owners are monopolists and they are virtually the kings of the place. They select passengers whom they should take and leave the rest behind.

" Then, Sir, the Minister has said that keeping of accounts is not practicable when the bus-owner has to deal with a number of passengers, and that the Government will be satisfied with a certain amount which may be fixed on some agreement which they may enter into with bus-owners. Sir, this will give rise to a lot of underhand dealings, because the man who has got the biggest pull with the Government will be paying the smallest surcharge. His hands will be naturally free to charge whatever amount he likes per mile per passenger. Let the Minister remember that it is not seven pies but five annas that is charged to-day. If he really wants to administer this measure correctly, let him ask the bus-owners or make them pay something fixed. Let not anarchy be here. I also know that in some districts, no new bus operators are allowed to come into the field. The old operator's uncle, or brother or some such relative is given new routes to operate. As a matter of fact, in Nellore it is only one man's show. A single man has got eighty per cent of the routes though the permits are not in his name, but in the name of his relatives. Therefore, I say, we are dealing with a very powerful monopoly and we have to be very careful to see that the burden of taxation is not shifted on to the poor."

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—" Sir, I rise to oppose this Bill because the Government want money to spend on certain items we do not approve of. It is not enough if the objective alone is fair. The means should also be fair. But here both the means and the objective are not fair. There is no guarantee that the people of this State will be given food. There is no guarantee that the people will be given cheap clothing. There is no guarantee

31st July 1952] [Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiar]

that the people will be given a democratic form of Government. Sir, the argument came that the proprietors of bus companies will have to bear the burden. I do not agree because in the year 1949, as far as my information goes, there was a proposal to have a surcharge on each ticket sold and after some discussion and also agitation, it was dropped. Then, the tax on seat was Rs. 17 and it was raised to Rs. 30, that is by about 78 per cent. But what happened later? This was actually collected from the passengers. Half a pie was added to the ticket fare per mile per passenger, but the bus-owners were collecting more. Let us come to the present measure. This will require the passengers to pay an enhanced fare in terms of a coin which is not really in circulation now. What I fear is, the conductors will be forced either to collect more or to collect less. In that situation, I am sure very many people will be prosecuted by the Sub-Inspectors of Police and lot of trouble will arise. There will be a deadlock facing this transport industry. After all, there is scarcity of transport services in our State and my humble submission to the Government is that this taxation proposal which will affect the poor people should be dropped. Hence, I oppose the Bill here and I am going to oppose it in the Select Committee also.''

* SRI A. GOVINDASWAMI NAYAGAR :—'' கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள், '' இப்பொழுது போட உத்தேசித்திருக்கின்ற பஸ் சர்சார்ஜ் வரியானது பஸ்ஸில் பிரயாணம் செய்கிற ஏழை மக்களை பாதிக்கவில்லை என்றும், பணக்காரர்களைத்தான் பாதிக்கும் என்றும் கூறுகிறார். ஆகையால் இதை ஒப்புக்கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்பதாகக் கேட்டுக்கொண்டார். கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் ஏழை மக்களுடன் தொடர்பு கொண்டவர்களா? அவர் ஒரு பெரிய செல்வந்தர் குடும்பத்தில் பிறந்தவர். ஒரு நாள் கூட அவர் பஸ்ஸில் பிரயாணம் செய்திருக்க மாட்டார். அப்படி என்றாவது பிரயாணம் செய்திருக்கிறார்களா என்று நான் கேட்கிறேன்? ''

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—'' பல நாட்கள் நான் பஸ்ஸில் பிரயாணம் செய்திருக்கிறேன். ''

* SRI A. GOVINDASAMY NAYAGAR :—'' பல நாட்கள் பஸ்ஸில் பிரயாணம் செய்திருக்கிறேன் என்று நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் சொல்லுகிறார். அவருடைய கார் ரிப்பேராயிருந்த காலங்களில் அவர் அவ்விதம் பிரயாணம் செய்திருப்பார்கள் என்று நினைக்கிறேன். (சிரிப்பு)

'' நிச்சயமாகச் சொல்லுவேன். இந்த பஸ் சர்சார்ஜ் வரியானது ஏழையைத்தான் பாதிக்கிறது. முன்பு விற்பனை வரியைப் போட்டபொழுது அது ஏழையைத்தான் பாதிக்கும் என்று சொல்லப்பட்டது. ஆனால் ' அது ஏழையை ஒன்றும் பாதிக்காது. வியாபாரிகள் விற்பனை வரியை சர்க்காருக்குக் கட்டப்போகிறார்கள் '', என்று பதிலளித்து விட்டார்கள். அதே போல வியாபாரிகள் இதற்கு பலமான எதிர்ப்பைத் தெரிவித்தபொழுது, '' '' நீங்கள் ஏன் எதிர்க்கிறீர்கள் நீங்கள் சாமானை விற்கும்பொழுது சாமானை வாங்குபவரிடமிருந்து வரியை வாங்கிக்கொடுக்கப் போகிறீர்கள் '', என்று சொல்லிவிட்டார்கள். ஆக ஒரு பைசா என்று வரியைப் போட்டுத்தான் இன்று சர்க்கார் காமதேனு என்று சொல்லக் கூடிய அளவில் கோடிக் கணக்கான ரூபாய்களை வசூலித்து விடுகிறார்கள். கனம் ஸ்ரீ ஸி. ராஜகோபாலச்சாரியார் சர்க்கார் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கும் மைலுக்கு ஒரு பைசா பஸ் சர்சார்ஜ் வரிப் பிரேரேபணையை முழு மூச்சாக எதிர்க்கிறேன். ஒவ்வொருவரும் கனம் ஆச்சாரியார் சொல்கிறதான அந்தராத்மாவைத் தொட்டுப்பார்த்துக் கொண்டு இந்த வரிப் பிரேரேபணையால் மக்களுக்குக் கெடுதி உண்டா இல்லையா என்பதை யோசித்தால் நிச்சயமாக எல்லோரும் இதை எதிர்ப்பார்கள்

என்றே நான் கருதுகிறேன். நீங்கள் இந்த பஸ் சர்சார்ஜ் வரியைப் போட்டு விட்டு உங்கள் தொகுதிக்குத் திரும்பச் செல்வீர்களேயானால் உங்களை ஜனங்கள் எவ்வளவு கேவலமாகப் பேசுவார்கள் என்பதைக் கொஞ்சம் சிந்தித்துப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். நாங்கள் பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டியில் பங்கெடுத்
2-10 p.m. துக்கொள்ள ஒத்துக்கொண்டோமென்றால் இந்த மசோதாவை ஆதரித்து அல்ல. இதை பூரணமாக வெளியே வரமுடியாதபடி செய்யவேண்டு மென்ற நோக்கத்தோடேயேதான் நாங்கள் ஒப்புக்கொண்டோம் என்பதை இந்தச் சபையில் சொல்லுகிறேன். இன்று பஸ்களில் ஏழைகளும் நடுத்தர மக்களும்தான் பிரயாணம் செய்கிறார்கள். மாணவர்களும்தான் பிரயாணம் செய்கிறார்கள், தொழிலாளர்கள் பிரயாணம் செய்கிறார்கள், சர்க்காரில் குறைந்த சம்பளம் வாங்குகிற உத்தியோகஸ்தர்களும்தான் பிரயாணம் செய் கிறார்கள். இப்படி இருக்கும்பொழுது இவர்கள் எல்லோரையுமே பாதிக்கக் கூடியவகையில் பஸ் வரித் திட்டத்தைக்கொண்டு வந்துவிட்டு இதனால் ஏழைகள் யாரும் பாதிக்கப்படமாட்டார்கள் என்று சொல்வது சரியாகாது தொழிலாளர்கள் இன்று தங்கள் வாழ்க்கைத்தரத்திற்கு ஏற்றபடி ஊதியம் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டால் கனம் ராஜாஜியைப் போன்ற மேதை வீணாகப் பணத்தை செலவழிக்காதீர்கள் சிக்கனமாக இருக்கக் கற்றுக் கொள்ளுங்கள். சினிமாவுக்குப் போகாதீர்கள். சினிமாவுக்குச் செலவழிக்கிற பணத்தை என்னிடம் கொடுங்கள்,'' என்று சொல்லுகிறார். அதே சமயத்தில் கனம் ராஜாஜியின் மந்திரி சபையிலேயே இருக்கின்ற கனம் மந்திரி ஸ்ரீ பட்டாபிராம ராவ் சர்க்கார் சிலவில் அஞ்சலிதேவிக்குப் பரிசு வழங்குகிறார். இவர்கள் சொல்வதும், செய்வதும் ஒன்றுக்கொன்று முரணாக இல்லையா? (பலத்த சிரிப்பு) கனம் மந்திரியே இப்படி பரிசு வழங்கினால் சினிமாவில் உற்சாகத்தை உண்டு பண்ணவேண்டுமென்ற நோக்கத்தோடு செய்வதாகத் தோன்றவில்லையா?

'' இந்த பஸ் சார்ஜ் ஏழைகளை எப்படி பாதிக்கிறது என்பதற்குச் சான்றாக இன்று குறிப்பாக ஒன்றைச் சொல்லுகிறேன். சென்னையிலிருந்து திண்டி வனத்திற்குப் போகவேண்டுமென்றால் ரயிலில் போனால் 2 ரூபாய்கள் கொடுக்கவேண்டும். ஒரு மைலுக்கு 8 பைசா வீதம் பஸ்ஸில் ரூபாய் 3-2-0 ஆகிறது ஒரு சாதாரண ஏழை இப்பொழுது ரூ. 1-2-0 கொடுக்க வேண்டுமென்றால் இது அக்கிரமம் இல்லையா என்பதை நீங்கள் சிந்தித்துப் பார்க்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். இதற்குப் பதிலாக பஸ் ரூட்டை அதிகரித்தால் ஜனங்களுக்கும் சௌகரியமாக இருக்கும். அதோடு மூன்று மாதத்திற்கு ஒரு சீட்டிற்கு 30 ரூபாய்கள் வீதம் பங்கு வரி போடப்படுகிறது. இன்னும் அதிகமான பஸ் ரூட்டுகளை ஏற்படுத்தி அதிக மான பஸ்களை ஓடச் செய்தால் அதன் மூலம் சர்க்காருக்கு அதிக லாபம் வராதா என்று நான் கேட்கிறேன். பல கோடிக்கணக்கான மக்களுக்கும் சௌகர்யம செய்து கொடுக்க ஏதுவாகும்.

'' அடுத்தபடியாக ஸ்ரீ திம்மாரெட்டி சொன்னதைப்போல் பஸ் ரூட்டுகள் கொடுக்க வேண்டியதேயில்லை. கனம் மந்திரிமார்கள் பஸ்களில் பிரயாணம் செய்தால் சட்டசபை மெம்பர்களைப்பற்றி பஸ் ரூட் விஷயமாக எவ்வளவு கேவலமாகப் பொதுஜனங்கள் பேசுகிறார்கள் என்ற விஷயம் தெரியும். அதனால்தான் சொல்லுகிறேன், எங்களுக்குப் பஸ் ரூட்டும் வேண்டாம். ஜனங்கள் கேவலமாக பேசுவதையும் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளும்படி செய்யவேண்டா மென்று கேட்டுக் கொண்டு என் பிரசங்கத்தை முடித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.''

*** SRI K. T. KOSALRAM** :—'' கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த மசோதாவை பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு அனுப்புவதை ஆதரிக்கின்றேன். இந்த மசோதாவானது எந்த நிலைமையில் மீண்டும் இந்தச் சபையில் சமர்ப்பிக்கப்படவேண்டுமென்பதற்காக, நண்பர் நிதி அமைச்சர் ஸ்ரீமான் சுப்ரமண்யம் அவர்கள் கவனத்திற்குச் சில விஷயங்களை நான் கொண்டு வர விரும்புகின்றேன்.

'' நீங்கள் இப்பொழுது கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிற மசோதாவானது பஸ் பிரயாணிகளை மிகுந்த கஷ்டத்திற்குட்படுத்துவதோடு மட்டுமல்லாமல், உங்கள் சர்க்கார் அதிகாரிகள் இந்தச் சட்டத்தை ஒழுங்காக நிர்வகிக்க முடியுமா என்பதையும் நீங்கள் சற்று யோசிக்கவேண்டும்.

31st July 1952] [Sri K. T. Kosalram]

"இந்த மாகாணத்தில் சுமார் 7,000 பஸ்கள் இருக்கின்றன. ஒரு பஸ்ஸில் 30 ஸீட்கள் இருக்கின்றன. 7,000 பஸ்கள் இருக்கும்போது, ஒரு நாளைக்கு ஒரு பஸ் ஒரு ட்ரிப் ஓடினாலும், 2 லக்ஷம் 10 ஆயிரம் பிரயாணிகள் பஸ்ஸில் செல்கின்றார்கள். சாதாரணமாக ஒரு நாளைக்கு ஒரு பஸ் 5 ட்ரிப்கள் ஓடுகின்றன. 7 ஆயிரம் பஸ்களும் ஒரு நாளைக்கு 5 ட்ரிப்புகள் ஓடினால், 10 லக்ஷம் டிக்கட்டுகளுக்குமேல் கண்டக்டர்கள் issue பண்ணுகிறார்கள். இந்த 10 லக்ஷத்திற்கு அதிகமான டிக்கட்டுகளை யெல்லாம் நீங்கள் பரிசீலனை செய்து, தம்படி தம்படியாக உங்கள் அதிகாரிகளால் வசூலிக்கவேண்டுமென்றால் அது முடியுமா? பஸ் முதலாளி கள்தான் அதைக் கணக்கு வைத்துக்கொள்ள முடியுமா? இதையெல்லாம் நீங்கள் சற்று சிந்தித்துப் பார்த்தீர்களா என்று நான் கேட்கின்றேன். அது மிகவும் கஷ்டமான காரியமாகும்.

"இந்த மசோதாவை நீங்கள் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கும்போது, நான் இதை எதிர்க்கின்றேன் என்று சொல்லமுடியாது. வரி போடவேண்டாமென்று நான் சொல்லவில்லை. ஆனால், நீங்கள் போடுகின்ற வரியானது இந்த மாகாண மக்களை எவ்விதம் பாதிக்கின்றது என்பதையும், சர்க்கார் அதிகாரிகள் அந்த வரியை எவ்விதம் வசூலிக்கப் போகின்றார்கள் என்பதையும் பற்றித்தான் சொல்லுகின்றேன்.

"எதிர்க் கட்சியில் இருக்கின்ற ஒரு சில அங்கத்தினர்கள் 'சொல்கிற போது, "அவர்களுக்கு சம்பளத்தை உயர்த்தவேண்டும், இவர்களுக்கு சம்பளத்தை உயர்த்தவேண்டும், இதைச் செய்யவேண்டும், அதைச் செய்யவேண்டும்' என்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டிருக்கும்போதே, 'வரியை போடவேண்டாம்' என்று சொல்வதைப்போல், நான் சொல்லவில்லை. (Interruption by Mr. Vinayakam) உங்களை நான் சொல்லவில்லை. 'எதிர்க்கட்சியில் இருக்கும் எல்லோரும் அம் மாதிரி சொல்லுகின்றார்கள்' என்று நான் சொல்லவில்லை. 'எதிர்க்கட்சியிலிருக்கும் ஒரு சில நண்பர் கள் அம்மாதிரி சொல்லுகின்றார்கள் என்றுதான் சொல்லுகின்றேன். எதிர்க் கட்சியிலிருக்கும் ஒரு சில நண்பர்களைக் குறித்துச் சொல்கிறேனேயொழிய, நான் எல்லோரையும் சொல்லவில்லை. குறிப்பாக, கம்யூனிஸ்டு மெம்பர்கள் சொல்லுகிறார்கள். இதைச் செய்தால் அதைச் செய்யவேண்டுமென்கின்றார் கள். அதைச் செய்தால் இதைச் செய்யவேண்டுமென்கின்றார்கள். அவர்களுடைய கொள்கை அது. ஆகையால், அவர்களைச் சொல்லுகிறேனே யொழிய, நண்பர் ஸ்ரீ விநாயகம் அவர்களைச் சொல்லவில்லை. அவர் Constructive ஆக யோசனை சொல்லுகின்றார்கள் என்பது எனக்கும் தெரியும்.

"ஆகவே, நீங்கள் வரி போடுங்கள், வேண்டாமென்று சொல்லவில்லை. ஆனால், அப்படி வரி போடும்போது பஸ் முதலாளிகளும், பொதுமக்களும், எந்த அளவு பாதிக்கப்படுகிறார்கள் என்பதை யோசித்து, நியாயமாகப் போடவேண்டும். ஒரு நாளைக்குப் பத்து லக்ஷத்திற்குமேல் டிக்கட்டுகளைப் பார்ப்பதென்பது முடியாத காரியமாகும்.

"இதற்கு வழி என்ன என்று நீங்கள் கேட்கலாம். பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டி அங்கத்தினர்கள் செய்யவேண்டியதை நாங்கள் செய்யவேண்டு மென்று நினைக்கவில்லை. இந்த மசோதாவைக் கொண்டுவர வேண்டுமா, வேண்டாமா என்று சொல்வதற்கு பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு உரிமை இருக்கிறது. மசோதா வேண்டாமென்று இந்தச் சபையில் கொண்டு வந்து விடலாம். ஆனால், அதைப்பற்றி முடிவு கூறுவதற்கு பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு விட்டுவிடவேண்டும். அதைப்பற்றி நான் ஒன்றும் சொல்வதற்குத் தயாராயில்லை.

"நான் சொல்வது என்னவென்றால், நீங்கள் மைல் ஒன்றுக்கு ஒரு ரூபாய் வீதம் வருஷமொன்றுக்கு ரூ 3,000, பஸ் ஒன்றுக்கு வரி போட லாம். 8 அணா வீதம் போட்டால் ரூ. 1,500 வருமானம் வரும். 4 அணா வீதம் போட்டால் ரூ. 750 வருமானம் வரும். மூன்று விதமான திட்டங் களை வைத்துக்கொண்டு வசூல் செய்யலாம். அதாவது மைல் ஒன்றுக்கு 4 அணா போட்டால் ரூ. 750-ம், மைல் ஒன்றுக்கு 8 அணா போட்டால் ரூ. 1,500-ம், ரூ. 1 வீதம் போட்டால் ரூ. 3,000 வசூலிக்கலாம். இவ்விதம்

நீங்கள் பஸ் முதலாளிகளிடம் வாங்கிவிட்டால். பஸ் முதலாளிகள் என்ன கேட்கிறார்கள் என்பதை பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டியில் அவர்கள் சொல்லிக் கொள்ளுவார்கள். அதைப்பற்றி நான் சொல்வதற்குத் தயாராயில்லை. நீங்கள் இவ்விதம் போடவேண்டுமென்றால் பஸ் முதலாளிகள் கேட்கின்ற சலுகைகளைப்பற்றி நீங்கள் நேருக்கு நேர் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளலாம். ஸீட் ஒன்றுக்கு ரூ. 1 அல்லது 8 அணா அல்லது 4 அணா வீதம் வசூலிக்கலாமா என்பதைத்தான் நீங்கள் பார்க்கவேண்டும்.

" ஒவ்வொரு பிரயாணியின் டிக்கட்டின்மீதும் வரி விதிக்கவேண்டுமென்று நினைத்தீர்களானால், கனம் நண்பர் ஸ்ரீ கோவிந்தசாமி நாயகர் சொன்னதில் தப்பே கிடையாது. ஊரில் மந்திரிகளை மக்கள் நல்ல விதமாகப் பேசமாட்டார்கள். சட்டசபை அங்கத்தினர்களாயிருந்தாலும், கல்லைத் தூக்கி விட்டெறிவார்கள் என்பதை மறந்துவிடக்கூடாது. ஆகவே, பஸ் பிரயாணிகள்மீது டிக்கட் கணக்கை வைத்துக்கொண்டு நீங்கள் வரி போடக் கூடாது.

" யார் மீது இந்த வரி போடப்படுகின்றது என்பது எனக்குச் சரியாகப் புரியவில்லை. இதிலுள்ள மர்மம் எனக்குத் தெரியவில்லை. கார்ப்பரேஷன் ஏரியாவில் ஓடும் பஸ்களுக்கு சர்க்கார் விதிவிலக்கு அளித்திருக்கிறார்கள். நகரங்களுக்கு விதிவிலக்கு அளிக்கவும் சர்க்கார் இந்த மசோதாவில் அதிகாரம் கொடுத்திருக்கின்றார்கள். யாராவது தனிப்பட்ட முதலாளிகள் சர்க்காரை அணுகினார்களா ? அவர்கள் உங்களை influence பண்ணினார்கள் என்பது எனக்குத் தெரியவில்லை. ஆகவே, குறிப்பாக எடுத்துக்கொண்டால், சில நகரங்களில் தனிப்பட்ட கம்பெனிகள் monopolise பண்ணியிருக்கிறது. அந்த கம்பெனிகளுக்கு விதிவிலக்கு அளிக்க இந்த மசோதாவில் இடமிருக்கிறது என்று நினைக்கின்றேன். ஆகவே, எந்த நகரங்களுக்கும் விதிவிலக்கு அளிக்கும்படியாக சர்க்கார் வைத்துக் கொள்ளக்கூடாது. இருந்தால் எல்லா இடத்திற்கும் இருக்கவேண்டும். கிராமங்களில் உள்ளவர்கள் மட்டும் என்ன பைத்தியக்காரர்களா என்று நான் கேட்கின்றேன். ஆகவே, universal ஆக இருக்கவேண்டுமே தவிர, சில இடங்களுக்கு exemption கொடுத்திருப்பது தவறு. அதைப் பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டி நன்றாக கவனிக்கவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு, இந்த மசோதாவைப் பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு அனுப்புவதை ஆதரிக்கின்றேன்."

12-20 p.m. SRI S. T. ADITYAN :—" I rise to make only one point, Sir. The Hon. Minister said that as far as poor people were concerned they did not travel by bus. I am not concerned whether poor people travel by bus or not. The question is whether we are not making bus travel costly by this tax. We must make the bus travel cheap for the poor people. We must approach this problem with this aim in view.".

* SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" Sir, I take very strong objection to this Bill and the fundamental principles underlying it. My hon. Friend, Mr. Adityan, said that we must make bus travel cheap for the poor people. But our Hon. Minister does not want the poor people to travel in bus. He wants them to walk for reasons of health. I do not know whether our Hon. Ministers will take this advice and walk to improve their health and not use their cars. If they do, we will save the expenditure now incurred on the maintenance of their cars. There is no use in giving advices. They must follow them themselves. They are not able to walk short distances. That being so, how can poor people walk distances of 25 miles, 30 miles and so on where there are no railways. The Hon. Minister has no knowledge of our rural parts. This I say emphatically. Let him tour the rural parts in the backward areas in Rayalaseema or in Guntur or Krishna districts.

There are many places which are not connected by rail, distances of 40 miles, 50 miles, even 100 or 150 miles. There is no use of asking people to walk such long distances. It is not for reasons of health that people go from one place to another, but on account of dire necessity they go to other places, and they have no other transport except the bus. That is why I say this is a tax on all except the rich who use cars. They alone are saved from this tax. This fact he must take into consideration.''

MR. SPEAKER :—'' The hon. Member is in the Select Committee; he can say all this in the Select Committee.''

* SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—'' Only one point, Sir, I wish to bring to the notice of the Hon. the Finance Minister. In our parts there are very few bus routes. There are possibilities for opening new ones. If private owners are not willing, Government might come forward to run buses on the new routes. This will bring in revenue for the Government. But it is not the policy of the Government to take up any development schemes. They want the people to use only the existing facilities. It is not a surprise to see this Government follow this policy. It was the Hon. Chief Minister who brought in sales tax which hit the poor hard. The tax proposed under this Bill will hit only the poorest of the poor. That is why we oppose the very principle of this Bill.

'' Another point which I want to bring to the notice of the House is this. There is a provision in the Bill that the accounts and other things should be submitted to the police. Everyone knows how the police are functioning now. Now they are being given more powers so that they could harass the people.''

MR. SPEAKER :—'' The hon. Member's time is up. The hon. Mr. Chidanandam will speak now.''

* SRI V. CHIDANANDAM :—'' Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Finance Minister in introducing this Bill said he was a villager. I do not think so. He might have been born in a village and known people coming from villages, but I am sure he has not lived in a village. I am a villager. I travel from village to village in buses. After the war, people have taken to bus travel and even for short distances they are charged high rates. The operators are not kind to the passengers. They allow more passengers than the capacity of the bus and also collect double the charges. They do not keep accounts. They are evading payment of income-tax. Though the surcharge is only one pie per mile the increase in fare will be considerable on long distance journeys. This will touch the pocket of the poor man very much. This would mean that the poor should not travel by bus.

'' Though there are number of bus routes now, they are not sufficient because, villagers, after the war, have taken to bus travel. Travel by carts entails long delay and inconvenience. They don't want to get hardened by walking the distance. After

walking long distances they will be tired and will not be fit for doing any work at the end of the journey. So they are taking to bus travel. The number of routes and the number of buses running in those routes must be increased. If this surcharge is paid by the operators without increasing the fare, and if they keep regular accounts, I have no objection to the Bill being passed. But even now they are not keeping regular accounts and they are evading income-tax. There is a lot of over-loading. It will continue to be so whatever might be the charge, whether it is 8 pies or one anna per mile. The rates should not be increased. The operator must be asked to pay the tax and directed to keep regular accounts. Several operators after getting a good profit sell the right on these routes at black-market rates to others. I would therefore suggest that all bus routes should be auctioned. Rich people have cars. It is only the poor people that take to bus travel. Some middle class people also travel by bus. All these people cannot afford to bear the increase in the bus fare."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The hon. Member is repeating what he has already said."

* SRI V. CHIDANANDAM :—"I say, Sir, poor people also are human beings. So they must be given the facility to travel quickly and well, by bus. If the charges are increased, bus travel will not be made available to the poor people."

12–30 p.m. * SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is no necessity to make any lengthy speech inasmuch as the Bill is being referred to a Select Committee. The Hon. Finance Minister has been attempting to advance arguments to sugar-coat a bitter pill with ingenuity, that the incidence of taxation will not fall on the poor and middle class people. The entire line of his argument is that this tax is not going to involve further increase on the incidence of taxation on the poor. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister whether, if after careful enquiry, it is found that this tax falls mostly on the poor people, he is prepared to withdraw the Bill. The second part of his ingenious argument is that it is very unlikely that the poor passenger will be called upon to pay this surcharge because the operators are not charging even the maximum limit of 7 pies per mile at present and that, therefore, the surcharge is likely to be paid by the operators. From this admission itself it is already clear that the poor people cannot bear any further increase in taxation. My hon. Friend, Mr. Ramamurthi, has been at pains to try to analyse that the incidence of taxation of both State and Central Governments is already Rs. 25 per head. I would also like to point out that in the City of Madras where the income of the Corporation is about Rs. 2·0 crores for a population of about 15 lakhs, the average incidence of taxation is about Rs. 13 per head. Per family of six members the Central, State and local Government taxes work out to about Rs. 170 per annum which is equivalent to two to three months' wages of an average worker in the City of Madras. Therefore, I do not agree with the statement that the incidence of taxation is low. The

31st July 1952] [Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai]

people of our State are already taxed to the maximum and they are not in a position to pay any further taxes. I do not know if the main object of the Bill is to see that the poor people give up this luxury of travel by bus and indulge in the past-time, the health-giving exercise of walking. If this is admitted it should be incorporated in the aims and objects of the Bill.

"The Hon. Finance Minister finally suggested that the taxation on the basis of surcharge at the rate of one pie per mile may be changed into one of a rate per seat per mile. If that suggestion is mooted, I would like to say that, unless the Government fixes the maximum rate the operator may charge the passenger for each mile; they will only be making the operators pass on the burden of taxation to the passenger, without at the same time the Government reaping the full benefit of the extra charge. I, therefore, feel that the present maximum rate of bus fare should not be enhanced under any circumstances. If the Government are really serious of getting further revenues, let them nationalize the bus transport in the State. The nationalization of bus transport in the City of Madras, in spite of the inefficient administration and in spite of the defects in the existing system of nationalization, has given us profits. Therefore, Sir, I would request the Hon. Minister to withdraw this Bill and bring forward proposals for nationalization of bus transport throughout the State, with a view to getting more revenue."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, on behalf of the United Democratic Front, I submit that we are opposed, as I already said once, to the increase of any tax or levy of new taxes at the present stage without a proper and comprehensive enquiry into the taxation structure and the incidence of taxation burden in our State. We believe that the revenue receipts under sales tax have been greatly under-estimated. We suggested that a conference of all the interests concerned, particularly in regard to sales tax, might be immediately convened so that the leakages in sales tax which are admitted on all sides might be properly gone into and a very efficient system of collection of sales tax at the present level could be introduced and thus improve the revenue position. We are of the opinion that, if the sales tax administration is improved, we can get nearly four to five crores of rupees even after giving margin for exemption of sales tax on essential food articles; our opinion is based upon the advice given by several persons who are connected not only with the payment of sales tax but also with the administration of sales tax. On that ground we are opposed to the increase of any tax or levy of new taxes.

"Sir, for one reason or other the purchasing power of the people has become very low and we, therefore, believe that this is not the proper time to levy new taxes. Besides any increase in taxation will have a direct effect upon the attitude of the Central Government towards the State, they might reduce the amount of grant or subvention or the block grant we require to push through our capital works. On this ground also, we are opposed to any

[Sri T. Viswanathan] [31st July 1952

increase in taxation or to the levy of new taxes. It has been our contention that the Government have not seriously considered the proposal of retrenchment. No attempt has been made in that direction so far as we know, after the present Government came into power. If we take this also into consideration, it will form another strong ground against fresh taxes.

"There are many reasons why all these Bills are opposed. You have been pleased to state, Sir, that the Bills are going to Select Committees and that some of us are members of the Select Committees; it is true we have agreed to serve on the Select Committees without in any way committing ourselves to the principle of taxation. We have agreed to do so because we want to oppose these proposals at every available stage. We shall not be afterwards told that having gone into the Select Committee, we have accepted the principle of taxation. We are making it clear to the House and to you, Sir, that at every stage, in the committee, we shall oppose the proposals, and if we succeed there will be no further trouble; if we don't succeed, still we shall oppose them from the preamble to the last clause in the House. Sir, I do not want to go into details as all the Members on this side who have spoken are unanimous on the point that this is not the time for new taxes from any point of view. Therefore, Sir, I once more make it clear that we have agreed to serve on the Select Committee only to oppose the Bill at every stage and we are not committed to the principle. Neither the Chairman of the Select Committee nor anybody else should tell us afterwards that having agreed to serve on the Select Committee we would not be allowed to raise this point of principle."

12-40 pm * THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Finance Minister who moved for the consideration of the Bill has permitted me to reply on behalf of the Government to the various points raised during the debate.

"Sir, I am glad the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has made it very clear under what terms he is coming into the Select Committee. He has told us that he is doing so with no commitments whatsoever that he agrees to the principle of the Bill. I am glad he has made his position very clear even at the very outset. Sir, he raised some other points also as to why he and his party were opposing the Bill. He still feels that our revenues from sales tax have been under-estimated. He thinks that retrenchment is quite possible, and so he feels that these taxation measures are unnecessary. I say, Sir, on the floor of this House to-day, that if we, the Government find that his observations are true, we shall not proceed with the Bill any further. None of us are anxious to tax the poor at the present moment. I am as much interested in the poor as any one on the other side, Sir. But the fact remains that faced as we are with a deficit of three crores in the Budget, we are compelled to adjust our income and expenditure by resort to taxation. It is as unpalatable to us as it is to those in the Opposition, that we should come forward with these taxation proposals. One hon. Member from the other side went to the extent

31st July 1952] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

of saying that the poor man is already crippled with the existing taxes both of the State Government and the Centre and that any more additional burden would only worsen his already poor economic condition. Mr. Ramamurthi accused us of being very greedy. If greed can be a remedy for meeting some of our financial difficulties, I plead guilty to such a charge because the task of running this Government is entrusted to my Chief and his colleagues. However unpalatable this proposed tax may be to those who travel in the buses, we feel it is our duty to carry on the administration.

"Sir, let me inform the House that when we decided upon this measure of taxation, several issues now raised by some hon. Members were fully considered by us. We considered at first the question of auction of bus routes. My friend Mr. Thimma Reddi had waxed eloquent over this. We viewed this question from different angles. Under the existing conditions, we came to the conclusion that it would not be advisable to auction bus routes for we had to give a guarantee to the man to whom we auction, that he can operate on this route without any interference for at least two or three years. Otherwise it would not be possible for the man concerned to start the workshop and have the necessary spare parts. He ought to be given a monopoly for at least five years. So, that was the one main reason which weighed with us in deciding to drop the auctioning of bus routes.

"A second suggestion had been made that we should increase the tax on the existing passenger seats in the buses. It was of course pointed out that we did increase the tax from seventeen to thirty rupees. But then we allowed the bus-owners to increase the passenger fares also. Let me inform the House what the Motor Vehicles Taxation Enquiry Committee has said. After elaborate enquiry they came to the conclusion that thirty rupees was the ceiling rate and the tax on seats could not be increased any further.

"An hon. Member Mr. C. V. K. Rao, I believe had said that there are still more than 2,000 buses which have been registered but are not running. He was of the opinion that if we were to tax those buses also, we could get an enormous amount of money. I should submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is a very flimsy argument. Considering the number of such buses which have been registered and which have not been put on the road, after all the revenue that could be derived is very meagre indeed. Moreover under the Motor Vehicles Act, a bus-owner is entitled to ask for a refund if he had been taxed and his bus is not running. Therefore I submit, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that Mr. C. V. K. Rao's suggestion cannot be accepted.

"The other suggestion to drop the proposal to allow the rebate on petrol tax would result only in an income of about rupees fifty lakhs. This is not at all sufficient to bridge the large gap in our Budget.

[Dr. U. Krishna Rao] [31st July 1952

" Previously there was a suggestion made that bus routes throughout the country could be distributed on a monopoly basis and the income derived therefrom by the Centre could be divided amongst the different Provinces. But ultimately that proved a failure.

" Friends like Mr. Thimma Reddi and Dr. K. B. Menon seem to be painting too rosy a picture about the huge profits earned by the bus-owners. Let me tell them that that might have been the case during war-time. But now the position is different. The bus-owners' position is none too encouraging at present. Let me not be mistaken as though I have come in defence of the capitalists. I am only stating the facts. Mr. Thimma Reddi is of the view that if we were to auction bus routes, then all our present deficit could be wiped out. Mr. Thimma Reddi thinks that it is very easy for a bus-owner to make profits in no time. I must say that my friend is sadly mistaken if he were to subscribe to that view. The picture is none too rosy as he imagines it to be. If I am not mistaken, if my friends do not mistake me for letting out a secret, I can say without fear of contradiction that some of my very friends who are assembled here to-day are involved in bus transactions at present. They would be fully aware of the present state of affairs of the bus-owners. It is very easy to make suggestions off-hand. Let us think well whether what we say is easy to be practised. Bus-owners are not financially quite well off at the present moment. Let us remember that.

" Mr. S. C. C. Anthony Pillai wanted at the outset an assurance from me that if I were able to get some huge amount from the bus-owners, then I should give a guarantee that I would not tax the passengers any more. Let me inform my hon. Friend that the Motor Vehicles Taxation Enquiry Committee did go into all details connected with the bus transport and arrived at the conclusion that we had reached a stage when we could no longer tax the bus-owners according to the seating capacity in their buses. When such is the case, how can I agree to the hon. Member's suggestion? Will it not create undue hardship both to the bus-company, bus-operator and the passengers also. Moreover what is the guarantee that we could be sure of the conduct of these bus-owners? Can we rest assured that they will not increase the fares at any time? An hon. Member had observed that it is not only the Government servants but ever so many persons who travel in the buses. The small merchant, the big businessman, the son-in-law going to the father-in-law's house—all these kind of people travel in our buses, even though the buses in our State are very rickety according to Dr. K. B. Menon. Anyway I do believe that faced as we are with a big deficit in our Budget, our passengers will not mind the slight increase which we have now proposed in bus fares. Let me inform the House that this proposed increase will in no way harass the public.

12-50 p.m. " My Friend Mr. C. V. K. Rao objected to the City Bus Service being exempted."

31st July 1952]

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" I did not object to the City Bus passengers not being taxed. If the principle of not taxing the City Bus passengers is good, then that principle must apply to mufassal places as well. That was what I said."

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" I am going to explain why we do not propose to tax the City Bus passengers. It is not because the City Bus is owned by the Government that we do not want to tax. In Madras City, the same persons will be using the buses twice every day, once for going to their place of work and again for returning home. We thought it would not be fair to tax this class of people. What applies to the Madras City applies with equal force to other cities like Rajahmundry, Coimbatore, Madurai, etc. After all, the number of buses coming under the exemption will not be more than 600. It will be left to the Select Committee to consider whether this exemption is necessary or not. Nowhere is it said in the Bill that the City Bus shall be exempted. I leave it entirely to the Select Committee to make any alteration.

" My Friend suggested that we must increase the bus routes and the number of buses on each route. After we took up office, the Government enunciated their policy of liberalizing bus routes and permits. But I must say that it is not entirely in my hands. The matter is in the hands of the Road Transport Authorities and the Central Road Traffic Board. Only appeals or revision petitions come to me. If I take a wrong decision, the matter is taken before the most Honourable Judges of the Court. In my opinion, all the abuses heaped upon the Road Transport Authorities and the Central Road Traffic Board are not entirely warranted. After all they are judicial bodies. We have altered the constitution of the Central Road Traffic Board so as to provide for the inclusion of members with judicial experience who will view things in a dispassionate manner.

" My Friend charged me with the sins of omission and commission of my predecessors. Like the saying ' The King is dead, Long live the King ', the Government continues and therefore we must take the responsibility, whether we like it or not, for the wrongs, if there were any, of our predecessors. The Government will give the most careful consideration to whatever suggestion is made by the Select Committee. I can only give this assurance that I shall do my best to remove whatever difficulty is pointed out in the field of motor transport.

" Unfortunately, in the order of Demands for Grants taken up, we could not reach the Demand relating to the Motor Vehicles Acts. Therefore I wish to take this opportunity for apologising to my Friend the Leader of the House for a wrong information which I gave. (An hon. Member : ' Leader of the Opposition.') I wish him luck in his attempt to become the Leader of the House, but we shall endeavour to prevent that In answer to a question put by him, I gave the impression that the 20 lakhs of bus tickets

got printed in England were exhausted. He said that the statement was not correct. I must apologise and say that the information given by the Leader of the Opposition was correct. There were enquiries later and I found that the tickets for which a trial order was placed were not exhausted. They are even now being issued on two routes. It is likely to take one more year to exhaust the 20 lakhs of tickets but I can say this much that no fresh order will be placed for printing those tickets in England. I thank you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity for correcting the impression that the Leader of Opposition was not telling the truth. I am afraid both of us were telling the truth, only from different angles.

" My Friend Mr. S. C. C. Anthony Pillai said that this bitter pill had got a sugar coating. We have tried to coat the pill with as much sugar as possible. It is left to the Select Committee to retain the sugar coating or remove it and expose the pill. I hope the Select Committee will return the pill with the sugar, so that not only the Members of this House but also the public can swallow it with ease.

" I can assure the House that all the points raised in this House will be considered by the Select Committee in a most sympathetic manner and we will try to bring out a Bill which will be acceptable to all."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

'That the Madras Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 4 of 1952), be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members :—

1. The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
2. ,, Dr. U. Krishna Rao.
3. Sri K. Rajaram.
4. ,, A. M. Sambandam.
5. ,, S. Panchaksharam.
6. ,, D. Dasaratharamaiah Naidu.
7. ,, N. Rajagopal.
8. ,, B. Vaikunta Baliga.
9. ,, H. M. Jagannatham.
10. ,, A. Balarama Reddy.
11. ,, I. K. Subramania Pillai.
12. Janab K. M. Seethi.
13. Dr. K. B. Menon.
14. Sri P. Thimma Reddi.
15. ,, M. Rajeswara Rao.
16. ,, T. Viswanatham.
17. ,, T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
18. ,, K. P. Gopalan.

31st July 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

19. Sri M. Venugopala Gounder.
20. ,, P. B. K. Rajachidambaram.
21. ,, P. Ratnaswami Pillai.
22. ,, S. T. Adityan.
23. ,, S. Ramalingam.
24. ,, D. Dasarathan.
25. ,, Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu.' "

The motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—" Under rule 83 of the Assembly Rules, I appoint the Hon. Dr. U. Krishna Rao to be the Chairman of the Select Committee."

(4) THE MADRAS IRRIGATION (LEVY OF BETTERMENT CONTRIBUTION) BILL[a], 1952.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

'*That the Madras Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 5 of 1952), be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following members; and*

'*That under rule 81 of the Madras Assembly Rules, the leave of the House be granted to have 25 Members on the Select Committee—*

1. *The Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.*
2. *,, C. Subramaniam.*
3. *Sri K. Rajaram.*
4. *,, P. Ranga Reddi.*
5. *,, K. V. Vema Reddi.*
6. *,, B. Krishnamurti Rao.*
7. *,, T. Ganapathi.*
8. *,, A. Appu.*
9. *,, P. Chellathurai.*
10. *,, K. Shanmugam.*
11. *,, T. Anantha Pai.*
12. *Janab K. K. Mohamed Shafee.*
13. *Sri M. Venkatasubba Reddi.*
14. *,, G. Latchanna.*
15. *,, B. Balakrishnan.*
16. *,, T. Viswanatham.*
17. *,, T. C. Narayana Nambiar.*

[a] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 30th June 1952.

18. *Sri T. Nagi Reddi.*
19. ,, *C. Kandaswami.*
20. ,, *M. Veerabhadram.*
21. ,, *Y. Audinarayana Reddi.*
22. ,, *V. Sankaranarayana Menon.*
23. ,, *Lakshminarayana Reddi.*
24. ,, *A. Govindaswami Nayagar.*
25. ,, *S. Vemiah.*' "

" Sir, in this connexion, I would bring to the notice of the House that since the inception of the Grow More Food programme in 1943, the Government have been constructing, expanding or altering a large number of irrigation or drainage works every year. The pace of the Government's action in this regard has been further accelerated by the Tank Improvement Scheme sanctioned in 1949. The Government have consequently been put to a large extra expenditure. On the other hand, the works have secured to the owners an increased or a more certain supply of water to their lands. It has given varying degrees of benefits to various owners of land as a result of which the market value of the land has either increased or is likely to increase. It is only fair that the Government should be enabled to recover from the owners of the lands so benefited a share of the increase they receive or are likely to receive without any exertion or expenditure on their part. This is technically called 'unearned increment.' In many cases the Government have also been announcing their intention to levy betterment contributions while sanctioning irrigation or drainage schemes. The previous Government decided to undertake legislation for the purpose and also got a Bill prepared. The Bill was referred to a Joint Select Committee consisting of Members of both Houses of this Legislature. Written memoranda were also received. But before the Joint Select Committee could meet to consider the memoranda, the previous Government decided to leave the matter to the new Government. The present Government, accordingly, considered the Bill, and has decided to introduce the Bill with certain modifications.

1 p.m. " I may also add that this Bill was introduced on 28th June 1952. The Bill was published in an extraordinary issue of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 30th June 1952. The present Bill was before the public for a month. I said that a similar Bill was contemplated to be introduced and passed into law by the previous Ministry. That Bill was approved by the then Ministry on 11th August 1951 and the Bill was published on 21st August 1951. So, Sir, hon. Members will see that this piece of legislation was before the public for at least about a year. The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition was included as a Member in the Select Committee on that Bill in 1951. The inclusion of his name in that Select Committee only shows that he wanted to co-operate with the Government in passing that legislation. That was a Select Committee

31st July 1952] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

of a House elected on a restricted franchise. Now, hon. Members are aware that they are elected on the basis of the adult franchise. In the words of the Leader of the Opposition himself, the present Select Committee is a more democratic Select Committee and therefore, I hope that he will co-operate with me in passing this Bill.

"Sir, since the Bill is being referred to a Select Committee, I need not go further into the details. Any suggestions that hon. Members may make, will be considered by the Select Committee. I request the House to give its acceptance to refer the Bill to a Select Committee.

"Sir, I have failed to mention the date by which the Select Committee's report should be presented to the House. When is the Select Committee to submit its report, Sir, . . ."

Mr. SPEAKER :—"I do not generally fix the date. I leave it to the convenience of the Government. The motion is—

'That the Madras Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 5 of 1952), be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members; and

'That under rule 81 of the Madras Assembly Rules the leave of the House be granted to have 25 Members on the Select Committee :—

1. The Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
2. ,, C. Subramaniam.
3. Sri K. Rajaram.
4. ,, P. Ranga Reddi.
5. ,, K. V. Vema Reddi.
6. ,, B. Krishnamurti Rao.
7. ,, T. Ganapathi.
8. ,, A. Appu.
9. ,, P. Chellathurai.
10. ,, K. Shanmugam.
11. ,, T. Anantha Pai.
12. Janab K. K. Mohamed Shafee.
13. Sri M. Venkatasubba Reddi.
14. ,, G. Latchanna.
15. ,, B. Balakrishnan.
16. ,, T. Viswanatham.
17. ,, T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
18. ,, T. Nagi Reddi.
19. ,, C. Kandaswami.
20. ,, M. Veerabhadram.
21. ,, Y. Audinarayana Reddi.

LEGISLATIVE ... TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

22. Sri V. Sankaranarayana Menon.
23. ,, Lakshminarayana Reddi.
24. ,, A. Govindaswami Nayagar.
25. ,, S. Vemiah.'

"The hon. Member Sri V. Balakrishnan has given notice of an amendment. I wish to know whether he is moving it."

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—"I wish to make an explanation before I formally withdraw my amendment. Without prejudice to my rights and without prejudice to my acceptance or otherwise of the Bill, I withdraw my amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The hon. Member is not then moving his amendment?"

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—"I am not moving my amendment, Sir."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—"Sir, I am not moving my amendment."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, you know that when we were speaking on the budget most of the Members were opposing the new taxation proposals. The Government, of course, were telling us always that the taxation proposals were brought forward only to cover up the deficit and to balance the budget somehow or other. Every time a taxation measure was proposed, we were told that that was not an unjust tax at all, it was quite just, it did not fall on one man but fell on all people, and the people were capable of paying that tax. In 1937, the sales tax proposal came up for consideration. The people were then told that they were not required to pay much, and that the tax was only very small. That sales tax has now become the big 'Kamadhenu.' People are being fleeced to-day by the imposition of this sales tax. They say 'Thank God if this sales tax is removed; this has become a great burden.' Again we were told when the proposal to increase the bus fare came up for discussion that it was after all only one pie, and that people were not going to be fleeced on that account. The Government said that they were not leeches or rackrenters. They said they were taxing people only because they wanted money to rehabilitate the people and to improve their economic condition. This increase in the bus fare falls on the poor people. Now this betterment tax proposal has come. It is said that this tax is proposed only for the purpose of irrigating the peasant's lands, and because the Government are spending money for irrigating his land, it is only natural that the peasant should pay for the betterment effected by the Government. Otherwise, it would automatically mean that the Government are not capable of rooting out famine either in the north or in the south. Speaking on famine, the Government were telling us that they would rectify the position and see that famines did not occur again. But unfortunately this Bill seeks to impose a tax upon the people of the

31st July 1952] [Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

famine areas. It is a tax on those people who are rooted out of their position and who are not able to get on with their agriculture. What is the area of the Lower Bhavani project? The area is Coimbatore and part of Salem. In what place is the Tungabhadra project constructed? It is an area in the Bellary and Kurnool districts. This area is probably one of the worst famine affected areas. It is the worst famine affected area even according to the report of the Rayalaseema Co-operation Enquiry Committee published in 1945–46. It is a tax which will affect the people who are now going to get the benefit of the Machkund project. It is a place where thousands of people died of starvation in 1943. The people there have not yet recovered from that great famine. This tax is going to be levied on the people of Malabar. In 1943–48 the food crisis in Malabar was so great that the people were uprooted from their homes. It is on these people that this tax will be levied so that they may become better. I must ask how is this tax going to be levied. Is it a small tax? Not at all. There is a provision in this Bill according to which the peasant is being asked to repurchase his land simply because certain irrigation facilities are given to him. Are not the Government going to collect water tax from the peasants? Otherwise they will have no interest in his land. They are getting water-cess from the peasants. The Government are placing every tax on the poor people. This is one of the taxation measures that has no parallel anywhere in this world. Let us take one provision in this Bill. The Government say that because they are going to supply water, the value of the land will increase. Take the Tungabhadra project. How many acres of land will that project irrigate? It may be about three lakhs of acres.

" The Government say that they are going to increase the value of the land by irrigation works. Supposing the value of the land is calculated to be Rs. 2,000, the Government will get half of it in twenty years. Now on account of the Tungabhadra project, a tax of Rs. 30 crores is going to be levied, simply because the Government are constructing the project. Is this taxation or is this routing of the people? I submit this is not taxation. Hence I oppose the very principle of the Bill. We accept the reference of the Bill to a Select Committee only with a view to oppose it tooth and nail in the Select Committee and to see that it does not see the light of day. We also want to see that such Bills as this are not brought forward in future. 1-10 p.m.

" Sir, it is not in the case of a few projects that the Government are going to levy a tax. They have plainly come forward to say that they are going to levy a betterment tax on improvements to channels, tanks, wells, reservoirs, drinking-water ponds and madugus used for the supply of water to the people. Wherever the Government have spent a little amount on such projects, they will levy the tax so that every man in this State who gets a little water out of a tank or out of a well will be subjected to a tax. To this extent it is not a taxation Bill brought in here to balance the Budget. On the other hand, it is going to break the backs of the

people. I warn the Government to-day that if this taxation Bill is going to be passed through this House at any time even after the Select Committee stage, the people who are going to be taxed are not going to accept this taxation. There will be a break in law and order. Let not the Government then say that either the Opposition or Sri Nagi Reddi is responsible for that. The Government are going to be responsible for any break in law and order on account of the betterment levy. This is a warning which should be heeded. Let the Government beware of it. Let not the Government say that the Opposition accept the principle of the Bill because they are accepting the motion for reference of the Bill to a Select Committee. If they are accepting the motion for reference of the Bill to a Select Committee, it is not as if they are going to be content with amendments to the Bill. On the other hand, they stand for weeding out of the proposition and for the complete dropping of the Bill. Why do the Opposition stand for that? I shall tell you the reasons, Sir. The people of our State are not at all benefited by the supply of water. The Congress Committee Reports have told us in the years 1936 and 1946 that there are three leeches which have sucked the blood of the people. They are the land revenue policy of the Government, the rack-renter who takes an immense amount of rent from the people, and the money-lender who is to-day facing the people with a cudgel. The peasant to-day is almost dead and hence there is no production. The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam talked so much about production yesterday and he has also been saying every day that he and his friends stand for greater and greater production. I want to tell him that if the Government are going to put this tax on the backs of the people, production is not going to increase but the debts of the peasant will increase. I will here say one thing and help the Government to know what actually the peasant is. I shall now read a quotation about the condition of the peasant. Of course, the reference here is to the ryots of Rayalaseema. But I can very well say that this description is applicable even to the areas of the South Malabar and Visakhapatnam, where famines have been raging during the last ten years. The quotation is—

'Agriculture which is the mainstay of a large majority of the people has been an increasingly losing proposition, due to the frequent failure of the monsoons and the consequent recurrence of famine. The artisan with his ancient tools and the agriculturist with his primitive plough drag on their weary existence, with nothing to inspire hope or Cheer.'

This is the description of the life that the peasant has been leading. The Government say that they want to give him a little hope and cheer. But they come forward with a proposal to tax him. Taxes have increased in innumerable ways. Now, added to the present tax, a proposal to levy a surcharge on land revenue is also coming up. Let the Government refer these Bills to a Select Committee. But we are not getting into the Select Committee for passing amendments. We are getting into the Select Committee

31st July 1952] [Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

only to see that this Bill does not see the light of day. We won't say that this Bill is a taxation Bill but this is a Bill which has been brought in to extract money from the people. Just as the bania fleeces the people to get some Rs. 10 or Rs. 15, so also the Government are coming forward to fleece the people and the Opposition are not going to allow this method to be adopted. With these words, we support the motion for reference of the Bill to the Select Committee to oppose it in the Committee."

RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR OF CHETTINAD :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have already made my general remarks on this Bill on the occasion of the discussion on the Budget itself. I am not going to take up the time of the House on this taxation measure as such but I want the Government to consider certain wrong things, if I may be permitted to use a strong word, which have been included in this Bill. I would like them to take very careful note of the import of certain words which have been put into this Bill which perhaps they do not intend. This House should be told even now when the discussion on the motion for reference of the Bill to the Select Committee is taking place, what the real intention of the Bill is. I am not able to understand very clearly whether the proposed tax is to be levied both ways. I do not know whether it is intended to levy the tax for minor improvements in irrigation facilities or for major changes benefiting the ryot, or for both. Let the Government make up their mind with regard to this matter. The Hon. the Revenue Minister is not in a position to make up his mind now. I do not want to embarrass him now. Let him say that he will take counsel along with his Colleagues in the Cabinet and make up his mind before the Select Committee meets. I have a feeling that the real intention of the Government, when they drafted this Bill, was to levy a tax on wet lands whose value might increase on account of a major irrigation work. But the words that have been used in the Bill give rise to some confusion. In the list of definitions, we find that 'drainage work' is described as including channels, whether natural or artificial, for the discharge of waste or surplus water and all works connected with or auxiliary to such channels, escape channels from an irrigation work, dams, weirs, embankments, sluices and groins. That means any small change made by the Government will enable them to rope in that land for the purpose of this levy. I do not think that is the object of the Bill and if that is the object, the Bill should not be allowed to be passed. I submit it is not the wish of the public that any tax should be imposed on any land which may be subjected to normal improvement. Even as it is, if there are no major irrigation works, it is the normal duty of the Government through the Revenue and the Public Works Departments to carry out certain repairs like the removal of silt in a channel and repairing of sluices. Simply because a sluice is to be repaired in August 1952, a tax should not be levied. It may have to be repaired in August 1952 and in September also. Therefore, my suggestion is that the Government should remove such words as give rise to such an interpretation. After all, the Legislature will be rid of its bother when the Bill

becomes an Act. Then the Revenue official may interpret it and say, 'I have no option; I have to subject this land to this taxation tor this small minor change.'

"We must not now forget the great reforms that we have introduced and the good that has happened on account of the conversion of the zamindari areas into ryotwari areas. One-third of this State was zamindari area and it has now become ryotwari area. I do not want to take up the time of the House by tracing the history of the zamindari legislation now. But I want to remind the House that for the past fifteen years this subject has been on the anvil of the Legislature. Just because the question of abolition of zamindaris was being considered, no improvements were made by the zamindars to channels, waterways, tanks, etc. Therefore, as soon as the Government take over those areas, it is their first and pre-eminent duty to see that all those areas formerly known as zamindari areas are provided with proper irrigation facilities. For this purpose, minor changes may have to be made. I want to ask whether it is the intention of the Government to levy a tax even on such lands which may be subjected to small necessary improvements. As a matter of fact, the Government have been carrying out in the years 1950 and 1951 some small works in the various zamindari areas for which they can take just credit. While I congratulate them on it, I want them to continue their efforts to see that the zamindari areas are properly looked after and that the ryots get some water without the channel being silted up.

1-20 p.m. "The term 'Grow More Food campaign' has been used here. I should say that the Government of India had given an outright grant under this head without any obligation on the part of the Madras Government. Now, to tax people as a result of improvement that may have been carried out under this head, is really unfair. Of course, the Government might have spent some money under this head and there might have been some improvement. But I would like to say that it was not at all the intention of the Government of India. I would urge the Government to see that the repair work done to some of the tanks by removing the silt and other things—I think they have spent something like Rs. 25,000 or so on such work—and the consequent improvements are not subjected to this betterment levy. Therefore this wording, viz., 'Grow More Food campaign' should be removed. There are some words, which are not mere words, but are dangerous taxation measures dealing with money affair. This is the simple truth of it. So, let the Government take care of these dangerous words. We have to be very clear in this matter. Because, one lawyer may say one thing and another may interpret it in an altogether different way. The lawyers of Tanjore will give one interpretation, while the lawyers of Madurai and Tiruchirappalli will give an entirely different interpretation. Coming as I do from the district of Ramanathapuram, one-third of which is a zamindari area, I know everything about irrigation works and the Grow More Food campaign. The Government have now given up this Grow

31st July 1952] [Raja Muthiah Chettiar of Chettinad]

More Food scheme. They must revive this scheme. Again, they have stopped the well-subsidy scheme, which also they must revive.

"In the 'definitions' clause, they have included estates. I do not object to the zamindari areas being included in it. If they had undertaken big irrigation schemes like the Bhavanisagar scheme, let them do it. I have no objection to levying betterment taxes in such cases, where major irrigation works might have been undertaken by the Government. It is said that Government have spent some money in the zamindari areas of Sivaganga and Ramanathapuram. If it is shown that some new irrigation works have been undertaken or some new channels have been constructed in that area, then any betterment levy on that area will be just. But if it is only a question of merely renovating an old tank or repairing an existing channel, then there is no case for levying any betterment tax. I only want that such doubtful words as are included in this Bill must be removed so that everything may be clear.

"Mr. Speaker, there is an important clause which states that—

'The Government shall be entitled to levy a betterment contribution, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, from the owner of any land which in their opinion, is benefited, or is capable of being benefited, by the construction, expansion or alteration by the Government of any work (including the installation by them of a pumping set) . . .'

I can understand 'construction' and even 'expansion' to a reasonable extent. But, the term 'alteration' is a very dangerous term. I want the Government to seriously consider the import of the word 'alteration' and do something about it. Again, I don't think it is right to include the installation of pumping set in this clause. If the Government had installed any pump-sets, let them send a bill, just like any other businessman or an engineering company, and get the cost. When they supply these pump-sets, let them send the bill and tell those people, 'Well, we are supplying you these sets on a contract basis, their cost is so much and the maintenance and running cost is so much, if you want to run them yourself, with a diesel engine, you can do so and we will charge you interest on the capital.' The Government can do only that. The inclusion of these pump-sets under this Bill is very dangerous. Even assuming that the Bill will go through, several alterations have to be made. I do not want the Government's intention to be one thing and what will be in force later to be another."

Sri G. LATCHANNA:—"అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లు గురించి ప్రత్యేకంగా ఆలోచించుటకుగాను ఒక సెలక్టు కమిటీని ఏర్పాటు చేయబోతున్న సందర్భంలో ఇప్పుడు ఎక్కువగా ఈ బిల్లుగురించి చర్చించవలసిన అవసరము లేకపోయినా, ఈ సెలెక్టు కమిటీలో నేనుసభ్యుడుగా ఎన్నుకోబడినందువలన ఈ బిల్లుపట్ల మా పార్టి యొక్క దృక్పథము ఏదోస్పష్టపరచవలసిన అవసరమున్నది గనుక యీ అవకాశాన్ని తీసుకొంటున్నాను. ఇదివరకు జనరల్ డిస్కషన్ లోనే ఈ బెటర్మెంట్ టాక్సు విషయమై మా పార్టీదృక్పథాన్ని స్పష్టపరచియున్నాము. కాని, మరొకసారి ఈ సందర్భంలో దానిని ప్రత్యేకముగా స్పష్టపరచవలసిన అవసరమున్నదని నేను భావిస్తున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా ఈ బెటర్మెంటుటాక్సు పద్ధతి విషయంలో చాలా అభిప్రాయాలు ప్రకటింపబడుతున్నాయి. ఈ బెటర్మెంటు టాక్సు అనేది ఇప్పుడు ఈ బిల్లులో స్పష్టపరచబడిన విధంగా చూస్తే, 1943వ

సంవత్సరము నుంచి జరగబడినటువంటి జలాశయ అభివృద్ధి కార్యక్రమాలవల్లనే ఉపయోగము పొందుతున్నటువంటి రైతులందరికీ పన్నువిధించే అధికారము ప్రభుత్వము ఈ బిల్లుమూలకంగా కోరుతున్నది. కాని 1943 వ సంవత్సరమునకు పూర్వము ఉన్నటువంటి పరిస్థితి గురించి ఏమి ఇందులో ప్రసంగింపబడలేదు. 1943 వ సంవత్సరమునకు పూర్వము మొత్తము ప్రభుత్వముయొక్క ఆదాయము మీదనే అభివృద్ధి పొందబడినటువంటి ప్రాంతాలలో ఉన్నటువంటి రైతాంగానికి ఈ బెటర్మెంటు టాక్సు ఏమి సంబంధములేదని, 1943 దరిమిలా అభివృద్ధి పొందినటువంటి ప్రాంతాలకును, ఇకముందు అభివృద్ధిపొందబోయే ప్రాంతాలకును ఈ పన్ను విధింపబడుచున్నదని తెలుస్తున్నది. ఇటువంటి విధానము ఈ బెటర్మెంటు టాక్సు principle ను భగ్నపరస్తుందని చెప్పకతప్పదు. Principle అనేపేరుతో, వెనుకబడిన ప్రాంతాలలో ఉన్నటువంటి ప్రజలు ఇప్పుడు ఇతరప్రాంతాలతోపాటు ఈ ప్రభుత్వము వల్లనే తమకు అభివృద్ధి కలుగగలదని ఆశించినంతమాత్రాన, వారికి కూడ ఈ పన్ను విధించడం అంటే ఇంతకంటె అన్యాయంలేదు. ఈ విధానము కాంగ్రెసుపేరిట నడుపబడుతున్న ప్రభుత్వాన్ని వీరు పూర్వము చేసిన వాగ్దానాలను, ప్రమాణాలను భగ్నపరచడానికే చేస్తున్నటువంటి ప్రయత్నమని మాత్రము చెప్పకతప్పదు. ముఖ్యముగా ఈ సెలెక్టు కమిటీలో నేను సభ్యుడుగా ఉన్నంతమాత్రాన ఈ బెటర్మెంటు టాక్సు ప్రస్తుత విధానాన్ని ఏ మాత్రము మా పార్టీ అంగీకరించదు దీనిని తీవ్రముగా ప్రతిఘటిస్తుందని నేను మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. నిజంగా, ఈ బెటర్మెంటు టాక్సు అనేది న్యాయమైన principles ప్రకారంగా, న్యాయమైన దృష్టితో, సమానబుద్ధితో ఈ principle అమలు జరపాలంటే, ఈ రోజున యీ మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రంలో ఉన్నటువంటి developed areas ను undeveloped areas ను విభజించి, ఇదివరకు ప్రభుత్వ మొత్తపు ఆదాయము మీదనే అభివృద్ధి పొందినటువంటి developed areas లో electricity లోగాని, జలాశయాల్లోగాని మరి ఇతరత్రగాని ఎంతెంతవరకు సౌకర్యాలు కలిగింపబడినవో దానికి proportionate గా అభివృద్ధి పొందనటువంటి వెనుకబడియున్న ప్రాంతాలకు కూడా ఆ సౌకర్యాలు మొదట కలుగజేసేటట్లు వాటికి priority యివ్వవలసి యుంటుంది. అంతేగాని, ప్రస్తుతము ప్రభుత్వము తలపెట్టిన విధానము, గత 36 సంవత్సరం నుంచీ కాంగ్రెస్ పేరుతో, మదరాసు రాష్ట్రప్రభుత్వ పక్షముగా ప్రజలకు చేస్తున్నటువంటి వాగ్దానాలను భగ్నపరచడానికే దోహదము యిచ్చినట్లు అవుతుంది. ఇది ప్రజలు ఏ మాత్రము అంగీకరించరని చెప్పక తప్పదు. వారు తప్పకుండా దీనిని ప్రతిఘటిస్తారని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. దీనిని ప్రతిఘటించేందుకు మా K.L.P. పార్టీ ఏ మాత్రము సందేహించదు. అందువల్ల కాంగ్రెసు వారివరకు ప్రజలకు చేస్తున్నటువంటి వాగ్దానాలను నిలుపుకోవలెనంటే, వెనుకబడిన ప్రాంతాలకు priority యిచ్చి, ఇదివరకు మొత్తము ప్రభుత్వం ఆదాయము మీదనే అభివృద్ధిపొందినటువంటి ప్రాంతాలకువలె, వెనుకబడిన ప్రాంతాలల్లో కూడా జలాశయాలు మొదలగు సౌకర్యాలు ఆ ప్రజలకు మొదట ఏర్పాటుచేయవలయును."

Mr. SPEAKER :—"The hon. Member may continue his speech after lunch. I now adjourn the House for lunch."

(After lunch—2-30 p.m.)

Sri G. LATCHANNA :—"Mr. Speaker Sir, ఉదయం చెప్పిన ప్రకారము ప్రభుత్వం యీ betterment tax ను పూర్తిగా లెవీ చేసేదానికంటే, ముందు మన రాష్ట్రములో వున్నటువంటి developed areas ను, undeveloped areas ను

31st July 1952] [Sri G. Latchanna]

విడదీసి developed areas లోని ప్రాంతాలకు ప్రభుత్వము ఎంతవరకు ఏ ఏ స్కీములను ప్రవేశ పెట్టి రైతులకు benefit కలుగజేసిందో, వేటికి investigation ప్రారంభించబడ్డాయో ఆ స్కీముల విషయములో ప్రభుత్వపు రెవిన్యూనుండి ఎంత ఖర్చు చేయబడిందిన్నీ పరిశీలించి, ఆ స్కీముల priority యీ undeveloped ప్రాంతాలకు ఇస్తూ, మిగతా విషయాలు developed ప్రాంతాలకు దామాషాగా ఎంత ఖర్చు పెట్టిందిన్నీ పరిశీలించి, ఆ దామాషా ప్రకారం అన్వయింపచేసి, యీ betterment tax ను అందరికి దామాషా ప్రకారం వేస్తేనే న్యాయంగా వుండగలదు. ముఖ్యంగా 1936 వ సంవత్సరమునుంచి, అనగా షుమారు 15, 16 సంవత్సరాలనుండి యీ undeveloped ప్రాంతపు ప్రజలకు ప్రభుత్వం సవ్యంగా యిస్తామని వాగ్దానాలుచేసిన ప్రకారం యీ undeveloped areas కు గూడా priority యిస్తేనే బాగుంటుంది. కాకపోయినట్లయితే యీ కాంగ్రెసు పేరుతో యిచ్చినటువంటి వాగ్దానాలను భంగపరచి యింకనూ యీ betterment tax ను గూడ వేయడమనేది ప్రజలు సహించరు. యీ బిల్లును పూర్తిగా ప్రతిఘటిస్తారని చెపుతున్నాను. అంతేగాకుండా ఈ ప్రభుత్వం పెట్టదలచిన betterment tax ను 1943 వ సంవత్సరము దరిమిలా ప్రభుత్వ కార్యక్రమాలవల్ల benefit పొందినటువంటి రైతులు యీ పన్ను చెల్లించవలసిందేగాని తక్కినవారినుండి కోరడము భావ్యముగాదు. అందుచేత యీ విషయాలలో ప్రభుత్వము చాలామారము ఆలోచించవలసివుంటుందని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. యీ betterment tax పేరుతో యిది ఒక ఉన్నతమైనటువంటి proposal అని ప్రభుత్వం ఆలోచించుచున్నదేగాని నిజంగా ప్రభుత్వపు అభివృద్ధి కార్యక్రమాలవల్ల benefit పొందనటువంటి ప్రాంతాలలో యీ betterment tax విధానమును ప్రవేశపెట్టకూడదని చెప్పుతున్నాను. ఒకవేళ యీ ప్రభుత్వము అట్లు అందరికి సమానంగా అన్వయింపచేసినట్లయితే మా పార్టీ ప్రజలను యీ బిల్లును ప్రతిఘటించమని ప్రోత్సహిస్తుందని అంటున్నాను. అందుచేత ప్రభుత్వము యీ betterment tax propose చేసేటటువంటి బిల్లును ప్రవేశపెట్టకుండా విరమించుకోవలసినదని కోరుతూ యింతటితో విరమిస్తున్నాను."

* SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the Motion before the House. The Bill says that it extends to the whole of the State of Madras and applies to lands benefited by channels, whether natural or artificial, for the discharge of waste or surplus water and all works connected with or auxiliary to such channels, escape channels from an irrigation work, dams, weirs, embankments, sluices and groins and all works for the protection of lands from floods or from erosion. It is not only to lands benefited by irrigation works, projects and schemes that have been recently provided by or with the help of the Government that this tax applies; it also applies to those which are covered by channels which originate out of natural resources and not necessarily artificially made either through the help of the Government or kudimaramath or through the help of the ryots. There are what are called developed areas and undeveloped areas in the State and Rayalaseema has been neglected for a very long time. It is only a few years ago that the Tungabhadra Project was taken up in addition to some irrigation and other minor works, like tank improvements and putting up embankments here and there. What about projects like Pykara and others constructed at a very great

cost, with several crores of rupees, from out of the State revenues? What about the projects near Godavari and Krishna in the Circars and others near Cauveri? They are proposed to be exempted from the levy of betterment tax. Is it just? Is it reasonable? Is it fair on the part of the Government to exempt these projects from the levy of betterment tax and tax some of the backward areas which have been neglected for a very long time and wherein only very recently some projects have been taken up on account of the agitation started by the poor people of these areas and the recommendation made by the Committee presided over by Mr. N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar and the report submitted by Mr. P. V. Subba Rao? The backward areas will be hard hit by the proposed betterment tax. I, therefore, say, with all the vehemence that I can command, that this betterment tax should not be levied. There are also certain areas where the people are agitating for works of an irrigational nature for the betterment of those areas. These areas also fall within the purview of the proposed legislation. The ryots in these areas will be hard hit by this measure.

"Sir, this Bill will be referred to a Select Committee and some of my partymen may also sit on that Committee. They have expressed their opposition to the measure and I oppose the Bill tooth and nail."

2-40 p.m. SRI C. V. K. RAO :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill is ill-conceived and intended to penalize the agriculturist. The so-called improvements on lands were long overdue and only some of them were carried out by the Government. Now the Government propose to tax the owners of lands in those areas by the imposition of a betterment levy. Surely the Government spent only the money that was collected from the tax-payers on these projects. Now the Government want to tax them again for these projects on the plea that the value of land has gone up. I am not able to understand how they have come to the conclusion that the value of land has increased by thirty times the net increase in the yield by the construction of these projects. Is it only to get taxes from the peasants that they have come to this conclusion? This is penalizing the peasants unnecessarily and therefore it should not be supported by any representative of the people.

"Sir, this Bill was already sponsored by the previous Ministry in August 1951, and it was dropped. Why should this Ministry, which is also a Congress Ministry, bring in this Bill again? It is because they want to get as much money from the people as possible. We have already said that this money is going to be spent only on the bureaucratic machinery, repressive machinery. They want to get money by giving different names to different taxes. One they call the surcharge on bus fare. This was already discussed. That is a tax on the poor people. This betterment levy is another way of robbing the poor. This Bill is based on certain silly conclusions that the Government have come to. They say that the value of the land has gone up by 30 times the net increase in yield. I submit, Sir, agriculture in our country is not a paying proposition. It is a

31st July 1952] [Sri C. V. K. Rao]

gamble in most cases. The poor agriculturist is tilling the land simply to make a living. But the Government's conception of an agriculturist is that he is a businessman, in the sense that he would be selling the land and making more and more money because some channel is constructed or some drainage scheme is taken up somewhere, and therefore it is that they should rob the peasants by imposing this levy. I would request the Government to drop this Bill, as it is ill-conceived and as this would unnecessarily penalize the poor peasants."

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—" Sir, there are one or two things I would like to point out regarding this Bill apart from objecting to the fundamental principles on which this measure is based. When I first heard of the levy I thought it would be on lands that received the betterment in the entire State. But I see now that it is to be levied only on lands that received betterment after 1943. This amounts to this that those areas which for some reason or other were not bettered by schemes and projects in the past are going to be penalized in future. Will it not be agreed by all that those areas of our State which received the benefit of schemes and projects prior to 1943 were improved from revenues collected from all over the State? Then why is it that those that are taken up later or to be taken up in future should be paid for by the people who are to be benefited? It also means that hereafter whatever improvements are made, the cost of such improvements must be met by the agriculturists and not be contributed from the general revenues of the State.

" Sir, it is said in the Bill that thirty times the net additional income shall be deemed to be the increase in the capital value of each class of land: and the total contribution leviable in respect thereof shall be fixed at one-half of such increase. If this amount is collected I am sure the entire cost of the development scheme would be met. This means that the people directly receiving the benefit under the schemes will have to pay the entire cost of the schemes, so much so the people in the poverty-stricken areas will have to pay during the next twenty years the increased income that they might get because of these development schemes. Therefore I would request the Government to review the whole thing and see that the levy is imposed in such a way that no discrimination is made against the backward areas of the State.

" Then, Sir, money collected from the agriculturists is utilized for providing amenities for the people in urban areas, whereas the agriculturists are asked to pay for the betterment schemes. It is unjust to ask the agriculturist to pay for providing amenities for the urban people and also pay for their development schemes such as irrigation projects and other schemes. I would therefore request the Government to review the whole measure and see that the levy is made to fall equitably on all."

SRI C. PULLA REDDI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, while introducing the Bill the Hon. Minister said that the Bill had been before the public for the last one year, and adduced that as a reason for

accepting this motion. I can only remind the Hon. Minister that the previous Ministry was not able to carry this Bill through because the whole public resisted it and the Ministry was forced to give it up. Let the Hon. Minister take that as a warning before trying to push through this Bill with the majority the Government command. Every one of the Members who spoke, whether on this side or on that side, said that the Bill was going to affect seriously the backward areas of this State, whether it is in Rayalaseema or in the Tamilnad or in Malabar. The other day my hon. Friend Mr. Balakrishnan sugested that the six crores of rupees spent on Rayalaseema for famine relief should be debited to a separate account and recovered later. At that time I thought it was only a joke and Government would not take it seriously. But now I find that the Government are going to take the suggestion seriously and execute it with a vengeance against the backward areas of this State.

2 50 p.m. "As my hon. Friend Mr. Nagi Reddi has already said in the morning, the Government are going to collect about Rs. 30 crores from the lands benefited by the Tungabhadra scheme on which they have spent only Rs. 18 crores. Such method of taxation is not acceptable even to friends like Sri T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi and Raja Muthiah Chettiar, the dearest friend of the present Ministry. The new Ministry has been loudly claiming that it has spent about Rs. 4 crores on the development of minor irrigation works last year, and that some of the works are pending. I would like to remind the House that, whereas they have spent only Rs. 4 crores on minor irrigation works, they are going to collect about Rs. 18 crores. Let my friends on the other side ponder over whether the tall talk of the Government that they have worked for the development of backward areas is sincere. How are the Government going to collect this in the backward areas of the State which are worst affected by famines? The report of the Rayalaseema Co-operation Enquiry Committee says:

'Deccan has always been the blackest spot of famine. The frequent recurrence of famine has completely crippled the peasantry and has reduced them to a state of abject poverty. He has hardly emerged from one famine before he is submerged in another.'

It is from that kind of peasantry the Government are going to collect the betterment levy. For example, the Government have spent about Rs. 5 lakhs to bring about 600 acres under K.C. canal and according to this Bill the Government are going to collect about Rs. 45 lakhs, i.e., about nine times of what they have spent on a small minor irrigation work. If the Government are so intent upon levying the betterment tax, may I ask the Government 'why are they not levying any betterment tax on the electricity schemes also?' The Government have spent about Rs. 29 crores during the last six years on electricity projects. Whereas the return on the expenditure on minor irrigation schemes works out to about 5 per cent, the return on electricity schemes is only about 1 per cent. Why don't the Government bring forward proposals to levy betterment tax on those people who are benefited by the electricity

31st July 1952] [Sri C. Pulla Reddi]

schemes and who are mainly the factory-owners and other capitalists? Is it because it is going to affect the purse of friends of this Government in Coimbatore, Madurai and other places? Why should they go only against the over-burdened peasants and get money? It is not for opening new schools, because the Hon. Minister for Education has already said that the Government are not going to start a Medical College in backward area like Rayalaseema; it is not to start new industries in the backward areas because the Hon. Minister for Industries has already said that the Government have no proposal to survey the metallurgical resources in the backward areas; it is not required for taking up any new irrigation schemes because the Hon. Minister for Irrigation has said the other day that the Government are not going to investigate any further irrigation schemes. Then, for what else is this money required? Sir, it is only wanted to give large sums of money as compensation to the zamindars; it is only wanted to give fat salaries to higher officers it is only wanted to keep a Police organization for guarding the feudal and colonial economy in this country . . .''

MR. SPEAKER :—'' The hon. Member's time is up. The hon. Member Mr. Lakshminarasa Raju will now speak.''

*SRI B. LAKSHMINARASA RAJU :—'' అధ్యక్షా, యీ betterment tax ను గురించి చెప్పేముందు అసలు యీ tax ఏ బాపతు రైతులమీద పడుతోందో ఆలోచించాలి. అలాంటి రైతుల కష్టసుఖాలు తెలుసుకుని మరి యీ tax వెయ్యాలి. చాలా ప్రాంతాలలో వందలకొలది ఎకరములుగల భూకామందులే వ్యవసాయ పెట్టుబళ్లు పోను, పన్ను భారములచే కృంగిపోతున్న యీ సమయంలో బీద రైతుల పై బడే యీ betterment tax ను వేయడం చాలా ఘోరం.

'' అసలు యీ రైతులు ఎవరు ?

'' పెద్దపెద్ద భూవసతులు కలిగి క్రమక్రమేణ కుటుంబాలు పెరిగి విభాలు కాగా వచ్చిన ఒకటి రెండు ఎకరాలు అమ్ముకొని చౌకగా యీ betterment tax పడుతూవున్న భూములను కొని వాటికి చాలా పెట్టుబళ్లు పెట్టి ఫలోన్ముఖానికి తీసుకవచ్చిన రైతులై వుంటారు. అలాంటి రైతులకు ఏ కొద్దిపాటి నీటివసతులనో కలుగజేసి యీ భూమికి betterment tax వేసినట్లయితే ఆ రైతులు కట్టలేక భూములను విడిచిపెట్టి పోతారు కూడాను.

'' చాలా గ్రామాలలో అధికాహారోత్పత్తికొరకు 1943 వ సం॥ తరువాత అనేక వందల ఎకరాల బంజరుభూములను సాగులోనికి తీసుకువచ్చారు. ఆ తీసుకువచ్చిన వారు ఎక్స్‌మిలటరీ సర్వీసు మెన్. రాజకీయబాధితులు యింకా భూమిలేని వ్యవసాయపు కూలీలు వగైరాలు అయివుంటారు. ఆ లాంటి పేద రైతులందరిమీద యీ betterment tax పడవలసిందేగదా !

'' కరవు తీర్చడానికి రైతులను ప్రోత్సహించుటకు ఏర్పరిచిన యీ స్కీము ఆచరణలో వారిని నిరుత్సాహపరచడంగాక మరేమిటి !

'' యిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వం నిర్ణయించిన ప్రకారం యీ betterment tax విధించినట్లయిన ఆ భూమి తిరిగి కొనుక్కున్నట్లే అవుతుంది.

'' పెద్ద భూకామందులుకూడా యీ betterment tax ను ఎదిరించక మానరు.

[Sri B. Lakshminarasa Raju] [31st July 1952

‘ ఉదహరణకు మా నర్సాపురం తాలూకాలో యీ బాపతు భూములు వేలకొలది వున్నాయి. వాటిని సాగుచేసేవారంతా సామాన్య బీద రైతులే వాటిని సాగులోనికి తీసుకురావడానికి ఎంతో కష్టపడి నష్టపడుచున్నారు. ఇంకా కష్టపడవలసియున్నది కూడా. ఈలాంటి పరిస్థితులుగల యీ సమయంలో ప్రభుత్వపు బడ్జెట్టును పూడ్చడానికి మోయరానిభారం యీ రైతులపై వేయడం మంచిదికాదు.

“ఈ పేద రైతులను బాధించేకన్న పెద్దపెద్ద భూవసతికల్గిన వారిపై వారి ఆదాయాన్నిబట్టి పన్నులు వసూలుచేసే విధానాన్ని ప్రభుత్వం ఎందుకు అమలుజరుపరాదు. అది అన్యాయం చేస్తున్నట్లు ఎక్కడా కన్పించదు. ఈ భూములలో చాలావాటికి పట్టాలుకూడా యింతవరకు యిచ్చివుండరు. అందుచే రైతు వాటిని సాగులోని తీసుకు రావాలని అనుకున్నా స్థిరపడని ఆ భూములకు పెద్ద పెట్టుబళ్ళు పెట్టడు. కారణం ఏమంటే యీ భూమి వాడికి స్థిరమౌతుందో లేదో అని భయమే. ఈలాంటి రైతులకు అప్పులుకూడా ఎవరూ యివ్వరు. ప్రభుత్వం యీలాంటివారికి సకాలంలో అప్పులుకూడా యివ్వరు. ఆలాంటి సమయంలో వ్యవసాయపు పనిముట్లు లేక అప్పులు తీర్చలేక నానాఅవస్థలుపడుతూ వున్న యీలాంటి రైతులపైనేనా betterment tax విధించతూ వుంటున్నది! యీ betterment tax రైతులను క్రుంగదీసేదిగా యున్నదని, అందుచే వేయరాదని కోరుచున్నాను. సామాన్యపు రైతులపై యీ పన్ను వేయడం ఎలావుందంటే ‘కుసికే నక్కపై తాటికాయపడ్డట్లు వున్నది’ ఆదరణ లేని యీ రైతులు ఎప్పుడూ ప్రభుత్వాన్ని ఏదో సహకారంచేయాలని కోరుతూ వుంటారు. అలాంటి రైతులకు సహాయంచేయకపోగా యీ పన్ను విధించుట ఎలా వుందనగా అన్నవస్త్రాలికులలోనైతె యాచనకుపోతే వున్నవస్త్రాలు వూడలాకున్నారన్న సామెతగా వుంది. గాన యీ betterment tax అమాయకులైన బీదరైతులపై వేయడం ఎంతమాత్రం న్యాయంకాదనిచెబుతూ ఇంతటితో విరమిస్తున్నాను.”

3 p.m. SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO:—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, ఈ betterment tax విధానాన్ని గురించి తెచ్చినటువంటి కొత్త తీర్మానాన్ని అంగీకరిస్తూ ఒక విషయము గమనించవలెనని ప్రభుత్వమును హెచ్చరికచేస్తున్నాను. పన్నులు విధించేటప్పుడు ఆ పన్నులను ఏ రైతులైతే భరించగలరో ఆలోచించకుండా యీ betterment tax Bill ను ప్రభుత్వం తీసుకొనివచ్చారు. ఈనాడు దేశములో రైతుయొక్క ఆర్థిక స్థితి, సోమతను పరీక్షించాలి ఈనాడు మనరాష్ట్రములో ఆర్థికస్థితి, ఆర్థికసోమతు, విధానం అంతయుగూడా పరిశీలించి యీ పన్ను వేయవలసియున్నది. అట్లు చేయక రైతాంగముయొక్క కష్టములన్ని ఒకే విధముగా తీసుకొని, పేద రైతులను దృష్టిలోకి తీసుకొనకుండా యీ betterment tax అనేదాన్ని తలపెట్టింది. మా కృష్ణా జిల్లాలో అనేకమంది రైతులు, బీదవారై వుండుటవలన, యీ జిల్లాలో వున్నటువంటి అనేకవేల ఎకరాలను బాగుచేసుకొని సాగుచేసుకుంటున్నారు వీరు ఎన్నో విధాల కష్టపడి అప్పులపాలై యీ భూమిని సాగుకుతగిన పదునులోకి తెచ్చుకున్నారు. ఈ రైతుకు యిప్పుడున్న అప్పులు చూడగా, ఎందుకుకొరగాకుండా ఉంటున్నాడు. కుటుంబ పోషణ జరగడమే కష్టంగా వున్నది. ఇట్టి సమయములోనే యీ రైతుమీద యీ betterment taxను వేయ ప్రభుత్వము తలపెట్టింది. అందువల్ల యీబిల్లును కృష్ణా జిల్లా రైతులు అంగీకరింపజాలరని అంటున్నాను. ఈ సందర్భములో ఒక విషయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వము దృష్టిలోనికి తీసుకొనవలసిందని మంత్రివర్గాన్ని కోరుతున్నాను. ఇదివరకు కొత్తగా సాగులోనికి తీసుకొనివచ్చిన భూములు ఏ ఆయకట్టులున్నా లేక నీటివసతులు లేక నానాయిబ్బందులుపడి బాగుచేసుకున్నారు. ప్రభుత్వ

మువారు యీ G.M.F. అనే నుచ్చుతో, ప్రజలకు పట్టా యిస్తారనే ఆశతో యీ భూములను ఎన్నో యిబ్బందులకులోనై బాగుచేసుకున్నారు ఇటువంటి రైతులమీద యీ betterment tax వేస్తే, యీ జిల్లాలోవున్న యీ సన్నంది పేదరైతాంగము యీ బిల్లును ప్రతిఘటిస్తారని చెప్పుతున్నాను. ఇంతేకాకుండా రాయలసీమ మాదిరిగానే మా కృష్ణా జిల్లా చాలామటుకు వెనుకబడిన ప్రాంతము. యీ జిల్లాలో చాలామటుకు బంజరు భూములే. నీటివసతిబొత్తిగా లేదు. జిల్లా విరియాతప్ప, మరెక్కడగూడ నీటి వసతులులేవు. ఇటువంటి ప్రాంతముల రైతులమీద యీ betterment tax ఏల యీ ప్రభుత్వము వేయ తలపెట్టినదో అర్థము కాకుండాయున్నది. కృష్ణానది ఆనకట్టక్రిందమాత్రం షుమారు యాభై, అరవై వేల యకరాలభూమి సాగుఅగుచున్నది. యీ భూములకు ఎకరానికి రూ 17-8-0 లు మొదలు రూ 20 లవరకూ శిస్తుచెల్లించే భూములువున్నవి. ఈ రైతులు పంటను పండించి వ్యాపారముగూడాచేస్తున్నారు అటువంటి రైతాంగమును విడిచి పెట్టి, ఏమిలేకుండా, అప్పులబాధలతో మునిగితేలుతున్న యీ బీదరైతులనే పీల్చి పిప్పి చేద్దాము అనే ప్రభుత్వోద్దేశమును చూడ నాకు చాలా విచారముగానున్నది. ఈనాడు యీ వ్యవసాయ కూలీల తరగతికి చెందిన యీ బీద రైతులమీద ఎన్నో రకాల పన్నులు విధించి, యీ బీద రైతులనే కొల్లగొట్టడమనేది ఎంత సమంజసముగా వున్నదో పరిశీలించమని కోర్తాను. ఈ ప్రభుత్వముయొక్క యీ betterment tax surcharge, అనే విధానాలు ఎట్లావున్నవి అంటే, సామెత వచ్చినట్లు బంగారు గుడ్లు పెట్టే బాతునే చంపితే యిక మీదటగూడ బంగారుగుడ్లు ఎట్లావచ్చునో. బంగారము ఎట్లా దొరకునో, అలాగే ప్రభుత్వాదాయానికి వెన్నెముకగావుండే యీ రైతాంగాన్నే పీల్చి పిప్పిచేద్దామనేదే ప్రభుత్వముయొక్క ఉద్దేశముగా కనబడుచున్నది. ఇలాంటి విషయములో యీ పేద రైతు బ్రతికేదెట్లు, యీ ఖర్చులు, శిస్తులు, betterment పన్నులు ఎక్కడనుంచి తేగలడో ఆలోచించవలెను. ప్రభుత్వమును ఏవిధమైనటువంటి శిస్తులు వేయకూడదని చెప్పడములేదు. దేశములో పెద్దపెద్ద భూస్వాములు, వేలాది ఎకరాలు చేతిలోవున్న రైతులనుండి యీ betterment tax అనేది యింకొక రూపాయిన వసూలుచేయాలనేగాని, యీ పేదరైతులనే అన్యాయముగా బాధించడము అనేది అక్రమము మా జిల్లాలో కృష్ణా డెల్టా కింద సాగుఅయ్యేమాగాణీ భూములనుండి వసూలుచేసెడి శిస్తు వేరుగావున్నది. యీనాము గ్రామాల్లో సాగుఅయ్యే భూములమీద వసూలుచేసే శిస్తు వేరుగావున్నది. యీ భేదమును సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం రిపోర్టులో వివరించబడియున్నది. ఎట్లు వేర్వేరు శిస్తువిధానము ఏలవుండవలెనో అర్థముకాకుండావున్నది. ఇటువంటి శిస్తు విధానమును నేనుగాని, మాకృష్ణాజిల్లా ప్రజలుగాని ఎంతమాత్రము అంగీకరించరు. అందుచేత యీ పన్నుల విధానము వేర్వేరుగావుంచక, సరిసమానంగా వసూలుచేసేవిధానంగా యీ Betterment Tax Bill ను మార్చవలసిందని కోరుచున్నాను. అట్లా చేయకపోయినట్లయితే మా కృష్ణా జిల్లా ప్రజలు అందరూ యీ Betterment Bill ను ప్రతిఘటిస్తారనిచెప్పుతూ యీ Bill ను నేను వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నానని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను."

* SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had no intention at all to speak on this particular subject. Inasmuch as Communist member after Communist member from the U.D.F. began to oppose, without any reservation whatsoever, the betterment tax, I thought it incumbent on my part to draw a line of distinction between their opposition and our opposition. We do

not oppose any measure which the Government bring forward merely because it emanates from Government. Whatever we consider progressive we will support. Those measures that are regressive will be condemned by us. So long as any legislation is intended to tax the capitalists, we give our wholehearted support to it. But when it comes to a question of taxing the poor man, then such a measure can never enlist our sympathy. We shall then stoutly oppose it.

" So far as this betterment tax is concerned, we do not want to oppose the tax on principle. As a matter of fact we would support additional taxation of those classes of peasantry which may be classified as rich. But if the tax falls on the poor agriculuturists, we oppose it. Anyhow, our representative in the Select Committee will pay careful attention to amending the Bill in such a way that the incidence of the tax falls on the rich peasantry and that the lower layers of the peasantry owning uneconomic holdings are totally exempted. •

" Having drawn the line of distinction between the opposition of the members of the U.D.F. and that of the Socialists, I think I have made our attitude towards the betterment tax clear."

* Sri K. KOTI REDDI :—" Mr. Speaker, I do not know why on principle this Bill should be objected to. Of course the Bill involves one or two issues on which possibly some serious objections may arise.

" Mr. Speaker, you remember how I have been agitating on the floor of the Assembly that Government should change its ideas about irrigation policy. It is rather unfortunate that the Hon. Minister for Revenue should have come now with the proposal for the imposition of betterment levy or tax. If my friend the Hon. Finance Minister had brought this Bill, I should have been more glad. Well, why should I say this, I may be asked? It is because I believe that taxation is essential in the interests of the area which is underdeveloped and it is the duty of the Finance Minister to find out ways and means for covering the deficit, if any. Sir, taxation is necessary when we are running into a deficit in our Budget. But only he who can afford to pay and all who can afford should be taxed. That is the main proposition on which all systems of taxation are based. Other considerations like the incidence and certainty of taxation and the like, are of minor importance. This is what I have been saying for the past twenty years. The irrigation policy adopted by the British Government was very wrong. Whenever a project is started we should see whether the return is sufficient to meet the interest on the capital and the expenditure for maintenance and establishment. We ought not to consider the question of direct revenue to the Government, but we should consider only the benefit that would accrue to the people as a result of the project. Due to our previous Governments not realizing this fundamental fact, we have been led to this present chaotic state of affairs,

" So far as this Bill is concerned, I do not think I can object to it on principle. The Government propose to levy betterment tax in regard to all those irrigation projects which have been completed on or after 1st January 1943. It is but natural that they should think of imposing a betterment levy. The value of the lands benefited by these projects would have increased very much by this time. But the question is, what should be the principle behind such a levy? All those who can afford to pay should be taxed, from the date on which the irrigation project was constructed, if betterment levy has not been till now levied. This is what my friend Mr. T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi has also observed. It is not proper that the particular date, viz., 1st January 1943, should be fixed as the starting point. Those landholders who have been benefited due to irrigation projects, should be asked to pay the betterment fee from the time of the starting of the project. Because our previous Governments have neglected to develop some areas in the past, why should they alone be made to pay now?

" For that, there might have been some justification in the days when we were ruled by a capitalist Government which was interested more in getting a direct return on the capital invested. As I said before, we are now in different circumstances. I believe, and I think all of us believe in a Welfare State, in a Socialist State. If so, it is only proper that we should not impose taxes on the poor people. On that basis, it is really difficult for some of us to agree to the principles of this Bill. My submission is: remove that date 1st January 1943, and then make this tax applicable to all places. We all know that to-day, in certain irrigated areas, a tax of Rs. 5 is nothing, while in certain other areas, it works as a great hardship on the people. I have suggested on several occasions that there should be some principle followed in regard to taxation of water. Water should be taxed only with reference to its utility to the user, it should not be taxed arbitrarily because it is made available, and simply because a capitalist Government was observing that method. The actual utility of the water that is made available for irrigation purposes should really be the consideration. 3-10 p.m.

" Again, we are all supposed to pay land revenue on the basis of the net income we derive. But in certain places, both land revenue and water tax are collected on the basis of the net income. The previous Government collected a water rate of Rs. 5 in areas which were supplied water from Mettur; but at the same time they were getting Rs. 10 as land revenue and water tax from poor ryots in areas where they had to spend not less than Rs. 100 for getting water for irrigating one acre of land as in the case of river channels. Such a policy is absolutely wrong. I only plead now that a different principle based on the utility of water should be applied. The Bill says that the net increase in the return will be capitalized at thirty times its value. I submit, Sir, that to arrive at the net income is not an easy thing. On account of the rough and ready methods that have been followed all along in regard to the taxation

of land, it is impossible to arrive at any uniform basis for finding out the net income. Again, there is great difference between land in one area and land in another area, between land paying a revenue of Rs. 3 or Rs. 4 and that paying only 6 annas or 8 annas an acre, in regard to fertility, etc., and it is almost impossible for any Settlement Officer or statistician or for the Economic Adviser to arrive at any correct estimate of the net income. Thus, there are many practical difficulties to be overcome. Anyway, I submit, Sir, I am not against the provisions of this Bill. My objections are much wider, and I hope that the Government will give due consideration to what I have stated and see to it that in the Select Committee stage some principles are laid down in the matter of the levy of this tax, so that the burden if imposed may fall on all areas and all persons uniformly."

SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, ഈ betterment levy മലബാറിനെ എങ്ങിനെ ബാധിക്കുന്നു എന്നുള്ളതിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു ഇവിടെ പറയാതെ ഇരിക്കുവാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല. മൂന്നിൽ ചില്വാനം കോടി ഉറുപ്പിക ചിലവാക്കുന്ന മലമ്പുഴ പദ്ധതിയിൽനിന്നു ആറു കോടി ഉറുപ്പികയിൽ അധികമാണ് ഗവൺമെണ്ടിന്നു കൊടുക്കുവാൻ പോകുന്നതു്. ഇതിൽ മലബാറിലെ ജനങ്ങളോടു ചെയ്യുന്ന അനീതി എന്താണ്. മലബാറിലെ ജനങ്ങളുടെ ആവശ്യങ്ങളെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു പല സംഗതികളെപ്പററിയും ഈ ബഡ്ജററു സെഷനിൽ മലബാറിലെ മെമ്പർമാരായ ഞങ്ങൾ പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ടു് ഒരു medical college വേണം, ഒരു engineering college വേണം Electricity നടപ്പിലാക്കണം എന്നിങ്ങനെയുള്ള ആവശ്യങ്ങൾ ഒന്നും നടപ്പിലാക്കാനുള്ള യാതൊരു പരിപാടിയും കൊണ്ടുവരാതെ ഇന്നു ആദ്യമായി ഒരു നല്ല scheme മലബാറിൽ വന്നതുതന്നെ ആപത്തായി എന്ന നിലയിൽ പരിശോധിക്കാൻ നാട്ടുകാർക്കു വിട്ടുകൊടുക്കുകയാണു് ചെയ്യുന്നതു്. ഇങ്ങിനെ ഒരു scheme നാട്ടിൽ ഉണ്ടാകരുതു് എന്നു ജനങ്ങളോടു അഭ്യർത്ഥിക്കുന്ന ഒരു നിലയാണു് ഗവൺമെണ്ടു് എടുത്തിട്ടുള്ളതു്. അതുകൊണ്ടു ഇതിനെ എതിർക്കാതെ ഇരിക്കുവാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല. Select കമ്മിററിയിൽ ഈ നിയമത്തെ എതിർത്തു ഈ സഭയുടെ മുമ്പാകെ ഇനിമേലിൽ കൊണ്ടുവരാതെ ഇരിക്കുവാൻ Select കമ്മിററി മെമ്പർമാർ പരിശ്രമിക്കും എന്നു ഞാൻ ആശിക്കുന്നു. എന്നാൽ മലബാറിൽ ഈ ആവശ്യങ്ങൾ അനുവദിച്ചിട്ടില്ല എന്നു മാത്രമല്ല, ഇഞ്ചിനീയറിങ്ങ് കോളേജും medical college ഉം ഇല്ല താനും. ഈ സംസ്ഥാനത്തിൽ മുഴുവൻ വെറുക്കപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുള്ള എം. എസ്. പി. യെ തീററിപ്പോററുവാൻ വേണ്ടിയാണു് ഈ പണം ഗവൺമെണ്ടു് ഉപയോഗിക്കാൻ പോകുന്നതു എന്നു നമുക്കു അനുമാനിക്കാം. മലബാറിൽ ഇന്നു പട്ടിണിയാണു്. നാട്ടിക ഫർക്കയിലെ ജനങ്ങൾ ജീവിക്കാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ലാതെ സിലോൺ, സിങ്കപ്പൂർ മുതലായ സ്ഥലങ്ങളിലേക്കു പോകുന്നുണ്ടു്. ക്ഷാമം നടമാടുന്ന ക്ഷാമബാധിതപ്രദേശത്തെ സംരക്ഷിക്കുവാനൊ, അതിന്നു വേണ്ട സാഹചര്യങ്ങൾ സൃഷ്ടിക്കുവാനൊ വ്യവസായം വളർത്തുവാനൊ ഉള്ള യാതൊരു പരിപാടിയും ഇല്ലാതെ ഈ ലെവി, ഈ Betterment tax, നാട്ടിനെ നശിപ്പിക്കും എന്നു ഗവൺമെണ്ടിനെ അറിയിക്കേണ്ടതുണ്ടു്."

SRI G YALLAMANDA REDDI :—" అధ్యక్షా, ముఖ్యంగా యీనాడు యీ betterment tax విషయములో ప్రధానంగా యీ తెలుగు ప్రాంతంలో ఏవో కొన్ని చెరువులు, కాలువలు మొదలైన చిన్న చిన్న యిరిగేషన్ మరమ్మతులు చేయించినంత మాత్రాన యీ ప్రభుత్వం యీనాడు యీ betterment tax అనే బిల్లును ఒకదానిని తీసుకొనివచ్చారు. ఈ రోజులలో ప్రజలు సాగుచేసుకొని అనుభవించేందుకు పొలం లేక ఏవో బంజరుభూములు సాగుచేసుకొని అనేక కష్టాలకులోనై యీ రోజుకుకూడా కష్టాలనుండి బయటపడలేకుండా ఉన్నారు. ముఖ్యంగా మా నెల్లూరు జిల్లాలోని కందుకూరు, పొదిలి, దర్శి తాలూకాలు రాయలసీమ కన్న యింకా అధ్వాన్న పుస్థితిలోవున్నవి. ఇక్కడవుండే రైతులు, వారి ప్రాంతా

లలో చెరువులు మొదలైనవి బాగుచేయబడక ఆ రైతులుపడే బాధలు చెప్పనలవిలేకుండా యున్నవి. ఏవో కొద్ది మరమ్మతులు చేయించినందున యీ **betterment tax** ను యిప్పుడు చెల్లించవలసిన అగత్యము యీ బిల్లువల్ల కనబడుచున్నది. ప్రభుత్వమునకు ఎంతో డబ్బు యిప్పుడు అవసరమున్నదనిన్నీ, అందువల్ల యీ బిల్లును తెచ్చామని అంటున్నారు. ఈనాడు దేశములో ముఖ్యంగా రాయలసీమలోను, అందుకు సరిసమానంగా కరువుతో బాధపడుచున్నటువంటి పైన చెప్పిన తాలూకాలలోని ప్రజలు యీనాడు అప్పులు సొప్పులు చేసుకొని ఎంతో బాధలుపడుతూ కుటుంబపోషణకే కష్టపడుతూ ఉన్నారు. అంతేకాకుండా వారికి పండే పంటకూడా చాలా తక్కువ. ఒక సంవత్సరం వర్షముపుంటే, మరొక నాలుగు సంవత్సరాలవరకు వర్షము లేకుండా ఉండును. ఒక రైతుకు రెండు ఎకరాలు వుంటే నాలుగుపుట్లు గింజలు పండుట చాలా దుర్లభము. అట్లాంటి పంటతో ఆ రైతు కుటుంబపోషణ ఎలా జరుగుతుందో ప్రభుత్వము గమనించవలెను. ఇప్పుడు యీ పేద రైతాంగమునుంచి వసూలు చేయదలచిన ఈ **betterment tax** పెద్దపెద్ద భూస్వాములనుండి మరొకరూపాన వసూలుచేస్తే బాగుంటుందిగాని, యీ పేదరైతులను అనేక అప్పులలో మునిగివున్న వాళ్లను యింకను పైకి లేవకుండా ముంచడమవుతున్నది. జమీందారీలు ప్రభుత్వం స్వాధీనము చేసుకున్న తర్వాత ఈ రైతులకు నీటి సౌకర్యాలు లేకపోయినప్పటికిని, శిస్తు మాత్రము పెంచారు. ఈ రోజులలో యీ మెట్ట తాలూకాలలోని రైతులకు 80, 90 రూపాయలు శిస్తుకట్టే రైతులకుగూడా యీ పన్ను వేసినను వాళ్లుగూడ కట్టలేని స్థితిలో వున్నారు. ఈ బిల్లును పేద రైతాంగమే కాకుండా, రాష్ట్రములోని యితర ప్రజానీకముగూడ ప్రతిఘటిస్తున్నారు. కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వానికి నేను చెప్పుతున్నదేమిటంటే, యీ పన్ను విధానం యీ పేద రైతాంగము యీ కరువు సమయములో భరించలేరు గనుక, యీ బిల్లును ప్రభుత్వం ఎంత త్వరలో విరమిస్తే, అంత మంచిదనికోరుతూ, యింతటితో విరమిస్తున్నాను."

SRI M. LAKSHMANASWAMI :—"అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లును వ్యతిరేకించు తున్నవారు రెండు తెగలుగా ఉన్నారు. కొందరు పూర్తిగా వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నారు. కొందరు పాక్షికంగా వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నారు. పాక్షికంగా వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నవారి వాదనలేమిటో పరిశీలించుదాం. శ్రీ ముత్తయ్యశెట్టియార్ ఈ బిల్లును మైనరు ఇరిగేషన్ స్కీములకు చిన్నచిన్న అభివృద్ధి కార్యక్రమాలకు అన్వయింపజేయవలదని మేజరు ఇరిగేషన్ స్కీములకు మాత్రమే వర్తింపజేయమని కోరారు. 3-20 p.m.

"కాని శ్రీ గౌతు లచ్చన్నగారు ఈ బిల్లును అన్వయింపజేసేటప్పుడు రాష్ట్రాన్ని అభివృద్ధిచెందిన ప్రాంతాలుగను వెనుకబడిన ప్రాంతాలుగను విభజించాలని వెనుకబడిన ప్రాంతాలకు బిల్లును అన్వయింపచేయకూడదని కోరారు. పైరెండు వాదనలు బిల్లును అన్వయింపజేయడంలో మార్పులను సూచించుతున్నాయి. శ్రీ ముత్తయ్యచెట్టియార్ వాదన ప్రకారం మేజర్ స్కీములకు ఈ బిల్లును అన్వయింపజేయవచ్చు. మేజరు ఇరిగేషన్ స్కీముల అవసరం సహజంగా వెనుకబడిన ప్రాంతాలకే ఉంటుంది. వెనుకబడిన ప్రాంతాలు ఈ భారం మోయలేవు గాబట్టి ఆ ప్రాంతాలను మినహాయించమని లచ్చన్నగారు కోరియున్నారు వెనుకబడిన ప్రాంతాలకు ఈ బిల్లును వర్తింపజేయుటద్వారా వారి అభివృద్ధికి తోడ్పడకపోగా వారంతా ఈ బిల్లునుచూసి భయపడి ఇరిగేషన్ స్కీములను వ్యతిరేకించుటకు మాత్రమే తోడ్పడుతుంది.

పైన రు ఇరిగేషను స్కీములను వెనుకబడిన ప్రాంతాలను మినహాయించుట ద్వారా మాత్రమే సమస్య పరిష్కారమౌతుందా! రాష్ట్రాన్ని వెనుకబడిన ప్రాంతాలు

[Sri M. Lakshmanaswami] [31st July 1952

అభివృద్ధిచెందిన ప్రాంతాలుగ విభజించినప్పుడు కృష్ణా జిల్లాను అభివృద్ధిచెందిన ప్రాంతంలో చేర్చుట జరుగుతుంది. కృష్ణా జిల్లాలోనే విజయవాడకు పడమరగా ఉన్న ప్రాంతాలు మెట్ట ప్రాంతాలుగా ఉన్నాయి. అక్కడ పంటలు గ్యారంటీగా పండుటలేదు. కొండపల్లి, మైలవరం ఫిర్కాలు, నందిగామ, తిరువూరు, నూజివీడు తాలూకాలు ఆర్థికంగా వెనుకబడి ఉన్నాయి. ఈ ప్రాంతాల అభివృద్ధికేదైనా స్కీము వేసినపుడు వీరివద్ద అభివృద్ధి పన్ను వసూలుచేయడంవలన ఈ ప్రాంత రైతులకెంతో అపకారం జరుగుతుంది. ఈ బిల్లువలన అభివృద్ధిచెందిన ప్రాంతాలనబడేవాటికి కూడ హాని జరుగుతుంది. కాబట్టి ఎట్టి మినహాయింపులు లేకుండా మొత్తంగానే ఈ బిల్లును వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నాను

"ఏదైనా స్కీము తయారుచేయుటకు, ఆ స్కీము అమలుపరచుటకు తగినవడ్డీ వస్తుందా లేదా అనేదిమాత్రమే గీటురాయిగా ఉండాలి. బ్రిటిషు ప్రభుత్వం తన హయాంలో ఇలాంటి ప్రాతిపదిక మీదే పనిచేస్తూ వచ్చింది. కాని ఈ మధ్యకాలంలో 1935వ సం॥లో మాత్రం నజరానాలు వసూలుచేస్తూ వచ్చారు. ఈ అభివృద్ధి పన్ను వెనుకటి విధానాలనన్నిటినీ మించిపోయింది. మామూలు పెట్టుబడిదారీ పద్ధతులనుకూడ కాలదన్ని మార్వాడీ వడ్డీ వ్యాపారివలె వ్యవహరింప జూస్తోంది. ప్రభుత్వం ఈ బిల్లును ఉపసంహరించుకోవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. లేకుంటే ఈ సభవారు దీనిని త్రోసివేయాలి."

* SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to express my disapproval of this taxation proposal. Anyway, as the Bill is going to be referred to a Select Committee, I want to express my opinion on certain general aspects of it.

" First of all, I want to remind the Hon. Ministers and the Members on the Congress Benches of the promises made in the Congress Election Manifesto of August 1936, when the Congress Party was not yet seated in power and was opposed to the British imperialists and the feudal elements in the country. The Members of the Congress Party promised land reforms, higher wages and better conditions of living for agricultural labour, and lessening of the burden of debt and also the burden of taxation. But to-day they are bringing forward measures to increase the already heavy burden of taxation. They have gone back on their promises after entrenchment in seats of power having come to an agreement with the feudal elements and foreign imperialists. Not only that. They are making speeches on the floor of this House about democracy. They have lost all semblance of democracy as is evident from the proceedings of this House all these days. When so many speeches opposing the Demands were made by Members on the Opposition Benches as well as the Congress Benches, they were not taken into consideration. But all the Demands were passed *in toto*. The Congress Members have become so democratic that, despite vehement disapproval of the policies of the Government, they had no other way except to vote for the Demands which they disapprove.

" I say the Ministers are not kind enough to take into consideration at least what the representatives of the people bring to their

31st July 1952] [Sri V. Sri Krishna]

notice. They have become so generous and kind as to equate starvation deaths with natural ones, as the Hon. Minister Mr. Ranga Reddi said some days ago and he was followed by our Finance Minister the other day."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Let the hon. Member speak on the general principles of the Bill."

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—" People cannot have confidence in a Government which does not believe the people. When certain facts including newspaper reports were brought to the notice of the Hon. Finance Minister, he did not believe them and said that the alleged starvation deaths were only natural deaths. When certain telegrams and reports about steep rise in prices were brought to his notice"

MR. SPEAKER :—" This point has no relevancy to the Bill. If the hon. Member continues in this strain, I will have to stop him."

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—" I oppose the levy of betterment contribution. It is a tax on poor peasants who will get some benefit from the development schemes.

" I endorse the proposal made by Mr. Anthoni Pillai. But he misunderstood the policy of the Opposition. The policy of the Opposition was made clear this morning by the Leader of the Opposition. We are not opposed to taxation as such. But we are opposed to the taxation the incidence of which falls upon poor people. We are prepared to support the policy of taxing the rich people. The Taxation Bills which have been introduced in this House are going to increase the tax burden of the common man who is already bearing a heavy burden of taxation. So, I oppose this and the other taxation Bills."

* SRI K. SUBBA REDDI :—" అధ్యక్షా, ఈ Betterment tax ను సూచించెడు బిల్లును నేను పూర్తిగా వ్యతిరేకించుచున్నాను. ఇప్పటికే కాంగ్రెసు దుష్పాలనతో బాధపడినటువంటి యీ ప్రజానీకముపైన వున్న పన్నులు చాలక, యింకా అదనపు పన్నులు వేస్తున్నారు. ముఖ్యంగా యిక్కడవున్నటువంటి కాంగ్రెసు సభ్యులందరికి యీనాడు ప్రజలకు కొనుగోలు శక్తి తగ్గిపోయిందని పూర్తిగా తెలుసునని అనుకుంటాను. ఇట్టి సమయములలో యీ Betterment tax ను గూడా భరించడం అంటే ఎంత కష్టమో ఆలోచించండి. ప్రజల ఆర్థికస్థితి ఎలాగు వున్నదో అనే ఆలోచన లేకుండా యీ tax ను వేయదలచుచున్నారు. ఈ సమయములో ఈ Betterment tax వసూలు చేయడమనేది నోరువాయిలేని, వెనుక అండాలేని యీ కడు బీద రైతులను లూటీచేయమనడం తప్ప మరొకటిలేదు. ఉదాహరణకు, ఒక గ్రామంలో దాదాపు ఒక నూరు రూపాయలు శిస్తు కట్టే రైతు 20 సంవత్సరాలలో 1,500 ల రూపాయలు తీర్చడమంటే అతడు ఆ డబ్బు కట్టలేక ఆ భూమినుండి వైదొలగడం అన్న మాట తప్ప మరేమీగాదు. యీ ప్రభుత్వం యీ మాదిరిగా Betterment tax అనే పేరుతో ప్రజలను లూటీచేస్తున్నారు. రాష్ట్రములో యీనాడు రైతుల ఆర్థికస్థితి పరిశీలించబడలేదు. ఈ పెదరైతులు ప్రభుత్వం

[Sri K. Subba Reddi] [31st July 1952

పట్టాలు యిస్తుందని ఆశతో యీ బంజరుగావున్న భూములను ఎంతో డబ్బు ఖర్చు చేసి, ఎండనక వాననక అనేక అవస్థలుపడి, యీనాటికి కొంచెముగా పంటకు అనుకూలపరుచుకొని జీవనం చేస్తున్నారు. ఈ ప్రభుత్వం పట్టాలు యివ్వకపోగా ఈ Betterment tax ను వేస్తే, యీ పేద ప్రజలను ఈ భూములను కొనుక్కొనమని ఒత్తిడి చేయడమన్న మాట. వీరికి భూములు కొనుక్కొనే తాహతువుంటే యీ భూములు బాగుచేసుకొని, శరీర కష్టము పడే అవసరముండదు అసలే యీ రైతులు అప్పులతో, కుటుంబపోషణ జరగక కృంగి కృశించిపోతూవుండే సమయములో యీ ప్రభుత్వం ఈ Betterment tax వేసి, నెత్తిన భారాన్ని యింకా జాస్తి చేయడమనేది చాలా అన్యాయమని చెప్పుతున్నాను. ఈ ప్రభుత్వ విధానమంతయూ చూడగా రైతును బాగుపరచే విధానముగా కనబడుటలేదు. విపరీతమైన చిన్న చిన్న ఇరిగేషన్ స్కీములు చేసినను ప్రజలకు అంత ఉపయోగించడములేదు. ఈ పన్ను భారంవల్ల యీ రైతులు వ్యవసాయము వృద్ధిచేయలేక మరింత నిరుత్సాహము చెంది వ్యవసాయమే మానుకొని, కూలికి నాలికి పోగలడు. అంతేకాని ఈ వ్యవసాయ విధానము వృద్ధిలోకి రావలెనంటే రైతుకు తగిన సహాయ్యము చేస్తేనే, ప్రభుత్వ ఆదాయముకూడ వృద్ధి అగును. ఈ టాక్సు వేయడములో అడుగున పడిపోయిన రైతును లేవదీయకుండా మరింత అడుగుకు తోయడము తప్ప మరేమిలేదు.

"శ్రీ రాజా ముత్తయ్య చెట్టియారుగారు పెద్ద పెద్ద ప్రాజెక్టులకు సంబంధించిన భూములకు అభివృద్ధి పన్ను విధించాలని చెప్పారు. బహుశా వారు చెప్పేదిచూస్తే కృష్ణా పెన్నారు ప్రాజెక్టును కట్టించి ఈ అభివృద్ధి పన్ను వేయమని వారి ఉద్దేశ్యముగా కనబడుచున్నది. అది మాత్రం సాగదు అని తెలుసుకోవాలి. మా ఆంధ్ర దేశములో ముక్కోటి ఆంధ్రులు ఆ ప్రాజెక్టును కట్టనివ్వకుండా ప్రతిఘటిస్తారని చెప్పుతున్నాను. వాళ్లు ప్రాణాలైనా తెగించుతారుగాని ఆ ప్రాజెక్టును మాత్రం కట్టనివ్వరు. ఆ ప్రాజెక్టును మీరు అనుకున్నంత సులభంగా సాగుతుందని కలలోనైనా తలంచవద్దు. ప్రభుత్వం రాయలసీమ కరువు పేరుతో ప్రజలకండ్లకు గంతకట్టి. ఆచరణలోకి వచ్చేటప్పటికి దక్షిణ జిల్లాలకు వుపయోగానికే యీ ప్రాజెక్టును నిర్మించే ప్రయత్నం జరుగుతున్నదని అందరికిని తెలుసును. మా ఆంధ్రులకు యీ మద్దు అర్థము కాకపోలేదు. యీ ప్రాజెక్టును నిర్మించి, కృష్ణానది జలమును మీరు ఎలాగైనా దక్షిణాదికి మరలించుకోవలెననే ఉద్దేశ్యమని దృఢమగుచున్నది. ఈ ఆంధ్ర జిల్లాలవారి నోరు కట్టి దక్షిణ దేశం బాగుపరుచుకోవలెననే వుద్దేశ్యం మంచిదిగాదు. ముందు మీరు మా ఆంధ్ర జిల్లాలలోను, రాయలసీమలోను వెనుకబడిన ప్రాంతాలను బాగుపరచిన తర్వాతనే మీ ఎట్టివిధమైన ప్రయత్నము సాగునేమోగాని, యిప్పుడు Treasury benches మీద కూర్చుని పెద్ద పెద్ద లాభసాటి సూచనలు మాత్రంచేయుట పనికిరాదు. మా ఆంధ్రులలో ఎంతమంది కడుపులు కాల్చి, మీరు ఈ నీరును తరలించ ప్రయత్నించేది అందరికీ గోచరమగుచునే యున్నది. గనుక యిటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో నేను ఈ దినమున వక్కాణించి చెపుతున్నాను. మీరు మాత్రం యీ కృష్ణా పెన్నారు ప్రాజెక్టును మీ జన్మలో కట్టలేరు. అది మాత్రం రూఢి తెలుసుకొండని చెపుతున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లు ప్రతిఘటనమూలముగా యీ ప్రాజెక్టు విషయము చెప్పడములేదు. ఎంతోమంది వేలకొలది అన్నములేక అలమటించిపోతూ, వ్యవసాయ సౌకర్యాలు లేక తిండికి, బట్టకు కరువై అనేక బాధలలో మునిగివున్న యీ పేద ప్రజానీకంయొక్క కష్టములు ఆలోచించకుండా యీ Betterment tax బిల్లును తీసుకొనివచ్చారు. ఈ బిల్లును మా ఆంధ్ర ప్రజానీకమంతయు ప్రతిఘటిస్తున్నది. మా ఆంధ్రులు

ఎన్నుకొనినటువంటి ప్రజా ప్రతినిధులు యీ శాసనసభలో ఎన్ని సూచనలు చేసి నప్పటికినీ, అవన్నియూ పాటించకుండా యింకా యీ పేద రైతులవద్దనుంచి దోపిడి చేయు బిల్లులను తీసుకొనివచ్చారు. దీన్ని socialism అనాలో communalism అనాలో తెలియదు. ఈ ప్రతిఘటన మా ఆంధ్రులందరి ఏకీభావమనే తెలుసుకోవలసి యున్నది. ఈ పరిస్థితులలో మీరు ఒక దమ్మిడిగూడా వసూలుచేయలేరు ప్రభుత్వం ఎంత ప్రయత్నించిననూ ఈ లూటీని మాత్రం ఆంధ్రులు సాగనివ్వజాలరని నేను హెచ్చరించుచున్నాను. ఈనాడు మా రాష్ట్రంలో సంపన్నమయిన విదేశీయులు 3–30 p.m. వచ్చి I.L.T.D. Company అనే పేరుతో పొగాకు వ్యాపారంచేసి, కోట్లకొలది రూపాయలు ప్రాశ్చాత్యదేశాలకు తరలించుకొనిపోతూవుంటే ఆ వ్యాపారస్తులమీద సరియైన పన్ను విధించి వసూలుచేయు ధైర్యము ఈనాటికి యీ ప్రభుత్వమునకు లేకున్నది. అటువంటి విదేశీ కంపెనీలు అన్నియూ విడిచిపెట్టి పేద రైతులను లూటీచేయుటకునూ, బస్సు ప్రయాణీకులమీదనునూ, యీ Betterment మొదలైన tax లు అనే పేరుతో రకరకాల బిల్లులను తీసుకొనివచ్చారు. ఈ నాటివరకు కూడ అప్పులు సొప్పులు చేసుకొని భూమిని బాగుచేసుకొని పొట్టపోసుకొనే పేద రైతులమీద యీ విజృంభణ సాగించుచున్నారు. పెద్దపెద్ద భూస్వాములవద్దనుంచి మరొక రూపములో వ్యవసాయ ఆదాయపు పన్ను అనేది వేసి, ప్రభుత్వమునకు కావలసిన లోటు సొమ్మును భర్తీచేసుకోవలెనేగాని, యీ పేద రైతులమీద లూటీచేయుట సాధ్యపడదు. కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వం దూరపు ఆలోచనచేసి, యీ విషయం సెలెక్టు కమిటీలో చర్చకు రాకమునుపే, యీ బిల్లును విరమించుకుంటే బాగుంటుందని చెప్పుచూ యింతటితో విరమిస్తున్నాను.''

Sri G. NAGESWARA RAO :—'' అధ్యక్షా, ఈ అభివృద్ధి పన్నును వ్యతిరేకిస్తూ నేను మాట్లాడుతున్నాను. అయితే మా తూర్పు గోదావరి జిల్లా కొత్తపేట తాలూకాలో పేరవరం పంపింగు స్కీముక్రింద 5 వేల ఎకరాల భూమి సాగు చేయవచ్చును. దాదాపు మూడువేల ఎకరాలు మాత్రమే సాగు చేస్తున్నారు. అయితే మా జిల్లా రాజోలు తాలూకాలో బట్టేలంక మైనర్ యిరిగేషన్ స్కీముక్రింద శంకరగుప్తము-చింతలమోరి గ్రామాలలో షుమారు రెండువేల ఎకరాల భూమి సాగులోకి వస్తుంది. ఇప్పుడు సుమారు వెయ్యి ఎకరాలు మాత్రమే సాగు అవుతూంది. యింకా ఎంతో భూమిని సాగులోనికితీసుకొని రావచ్చు. ఈ భూములన్నియు సాగుచేసేవారు వ్యవసాయ కూలి పేదరైతుల తరగతికి చెందియున్నారు. ఈ భూములు మొదలు బంజరు భూములయినందువల్ల, ఈ భూముల సాగుబడికిగాను వాళ్లు అష్టకష్టాలుపడి, అనేక తప్పులుచేసి ఆస్తులను తాకట్టుపెట్టుకొని, నానా యిబ్బందులు పడి సాగులోనికి తీసుకొనివచ్చారు. ఈ పరిస్థితులలో యిటువంటివారిమీద యిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వం ఈ Betterment taxను వేసే బిల్లును తీసుకువచ్చారు. ఈ భూములకు సరియైన నీటి వసరులులేక పంటలు అప్పుడప్పుడు ఎండిపోవడముకూడా జరుగుతూంది. అయితే ఈ భూములమీద ఈ Betterment tax వేసి ప్రభుత్వం వసూలుచేయదలచింది. ఈ పేదరైతులు అనేక అప్పుల బాధలవల్ల యిబ్బందులుపడే ఈ సమయములో ఈ Betterment taxను కట్టలేని స్థితిలో వున్నారు. ఈ అభివృద్ధిపన్నే గనుక ప్రభుత్వము వేస్తే పేరవరము స్కీముక్రింద సాగు కాంకుడ వున్న 2,000 ఎకరాలే కాకుండా సాగు అవుతూవున్న 3,000 ఎకరాలలో చాలాభాగాన్ని రైతాంగము వ్యవసాయముచేయకుండ విడిచిపెట్టివేస్తారు. యిదేవిధంగా బట్టేలంక స్కీము క్రిందవున్న భూమీ అంతా చవటినేలగాను, యిసక భూములుగాను వున్నవి. యిక్కడి పేద రైతాంగము ఈ పన్నును భరించలేక చాలాభాగాన్ని వ్యవసాయము

చేయకుండా విడిచిపెట్టివేస్తుంది. ఈనాడు ప్రభుత్వము తెచ్చిన ఈ బిల్లును ప్రతిఘటించమనిన్నీ, ఈ tax కట్టుకోలేమనిన్నీ, కట్టవలసిన పరిస్థితే గనుక ఏర్పడితే యీ భూములన్నింటిని వదులుకొంటానికి సిద్ధముగా వున్నామనిన్నీ, ప్రభుత్వం వారిని యీ బిల్లును విరమించవలెనని కోరమనిన్నీ దినదినము పిటీషన్లు వుత్తరములు నాకు పంపుతున్నారు. భూములు వదులుకోవడము తప్ప మరేదారి లేదని ఉత్తరములు వ్రస్తున్నాయి. ప్రభుత్వంవారు యీ విషయంలో దూరము ఆలోచించి ఈ పేదరైతుల యిబ్బందులు గమనించమని కోరుతున్నాను. అందువల్ల యిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వానికు యీ బిల్లును ప్రవేశపెట్టవద్దని కోరుచున్నాను. ఒక ప్రక్కన రైతులు అధికాహారోత్పత్తి స్కీమును వృద్ధిలోకి తెమ్మని చెప్పుతూ యింకొక ప్రక్కన ఈ టాక్సు వసూలు చేయడమనేది ప్రభుత్వం ఈ రైతులను నిరుత్సాహపరుస్తూవుందని చెబుతున్నాను. యిట్టి పరిస్థితులలో ఈ కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వం ఈ అధికాహారోత్పత్తి స్కీమును జయప్రదంగా పరిష్కరించలేదని చెప్పగలను. వ్యవసాయి కూలీల తరగతికి చెందిన యీ పేదరైతులు పూర్వము వున్న బంజరు భూములను సరియైన సాగులోకి తెచ్చిన పిమ్మట యీ Betterment tax ను వేయడమనేది ప్రజలను మోసము చేయడమనిన్నీ, శక్తి లేకుండాయున్న వాంమీద ఈ పన్ను వేయడమంటె ఆ పేద రైతులు ఆ భూమి విలువను 20 సంవత్సరములలో చెల్లించాలన్న మాట. అంటే పరోక్షంగా ఆ భూములను కొనుక్కోవడమే అవుతూంది. ఈ రైతులు కుటుంబీకులు, చాలా పేదవారు, వ్యవసాయ ఖర్చులు భరించుకోలేక, కుటుంబపోషణకే కష్టములు పడుతూవుంటే, ఈ tax ను ఎక్కడనుంచి తెచ్చి కట్టగలరు; ఈ టాక్సు యీ రైతులమీద రుద్దబడుతే ఈ రైతులను ఈ భూములనుండి వెళ్ళగొట్టమనేది స్పష్టపడుతున్నది. రాజోలు తాలూకా, బట్టె లంక రైతులకుకూడా యీ పన్నును రాకుండా చూడవలసిందని ప్రభుత్వమువారికి వాళ్ళకష్టములను తెలియజేయమని వుత్తరములు వచ్చినవి. ఈ Betterment tax వల్ల, యీ అధికోత్పత్తి స్కీము వృద్ధిలోకి తెచ్చుటకు చాలా ఆటంకముగా పరిణమించుటకు సందేహములేదు. ఈ పరిస్థితులనుపట్టి, తూర్పు గోదావరి జిల్లాలో మైనర్ యిరిగేషన్ స్కీముల క్రిందవున్న బంజరు భూములను సాగుచేయు పేదరైతులు యావన్మందికూడ యీ బిల్లును పూర్తిగా ప్రతిఘటిస్తున్నారు. ఈ అభివృద్ధి పన్నువల్ల, ఈ పేదరైతులను మరింత అప్పుల పాలు చేయడమేగాని ఈ రైతులకు సహాయకారిగా వుండే విధానాలను ప్రభుత్వము అవలంబించడము లేదని చెబుతున్నాను. కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వం ఈ బిల్లును సెలెక్టు కమిటీలో చర్చకు రాకముందే విరమించితేనే చాలా బాగుంటుందని సలహాయిస్తున్నాను. ఇప్పటికే పేదరైతులకు ఏవిధమైన సహాయము చేయకపోవడమువల్లను, పెద్ద పెద్ద భూస్వాములమీద, జమీందార్లమీద మరొక రూపములో అధిక పన్నులు వేసి వసూలు చేయక పోవడమువల్లను యీ కాంగ్రెస్ విధానము కష్టపడే వర్గాల ప్రజలకు వ్యతిరేకమైనందుననే పోయిన election లో కాంగ్రెసు ఓడిపోవడము జరిగింది. కాబట్టి కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వము పేద ప్రజానీకముయొక్క కష్టములు కనిపెట్టినప్పుడే, ఏ నాటికైనను యీ ప్రభుత్వమునకు రైతులు సహాయము చేస్తారు. లేకపోతే యీ ప్రభుత్వానికి యెదురు నిలుస్తారు. ఈ బిల్లులు అన్నియు పేదరైతులను మరింత అప్పులపాలుచేసి పైకిరాకుండా చేయడమేగాని, ఏ విధమైన సౌకర్యము యివ్వడము కాదని స్పష్టపడుచున్నది. ఈ కారణములవల్ల ప్రభుత్వము ఈ Betterment tax బిల్లును విరమించుకోవలసినదిగా కోరుతున్నాను. దీన్ని విరమించని పక్షంలో రైతాంగమంతా ఒక్కుమ్మడిగా నిలబడి, ఈ బిల్లును ఎదిరిస్తారని హెచ్చరిస్తున్నాను."

31st July 1952]

* Sri T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, I would not take much 3.40 p.m. of the time of the House. The objections which I raised to the previous Bill hold good in the case of this Bill also. We are going into the Select Committee without committing ourselves to the principle of the Bill. I am glad that on this Bill there was a greater and a more frank expression of views also from the Ministerialist benches. Some of them said that they were greatly opposed to many of the provisions of this Bill. That only shows how correct I was when I said this morning that there was opposition to this Bill from the other side also. I am glad that the Congress Members expressed their opposition to the Bill.

" The Hon. Minister in the course of his speech said that I was a Member of the Select Committee on the previous Bill. I was a Member of that Select Committee. But then what did I do on that Select Committee? I may tell the Hon. Minister for his information that I saw to the extent that I could that the last Bill, after the Select Committee stage, did not see the light of day. I am going to do the same thing that I did in the last Select Committee. I hope the same fate will overtake this Bill also. The Hon. Minister might have noted the points raised by the Members of the U.D.F. the K.L.P. and the Socialist Party. Those points really contain a good deal of factual information. Those points refer to specific details showing how this betterment tax will ruin almost all the tenants in the State except in very few places. I hope, Sir, that Members coming from all the districts will have a keen eye on this Bill and its progress. While we consent to go into a Select Committee, we are not committing ourselves to the principle of the Bill or its provisions in any manner. We oppose this Bill in the interests of the people."

* The Hon. Sri M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I may tell hon. Members that I do not feel it a pleasant duty to pilot this taxation measure. But the ways and means positon of the State being what it is to-day, we have to explore the possibilities of getting money from the people. We have hit upon this plan thinking that this is a more equitable and scientific way of raising money. The hon. Member, Mr. Nagi Reddi, as usual, referred to the famine conditions in Rayalaseema, and he wanted that Rayalaseema should be improved. (Sri T. Nagi Reddi : I said that with reference to all parts of the State.) But the hon. Member emphasized the improvement of Rayalaseema. I may say that if we want to eradicate famine, we must do something on a large scale to root it out. We will have to turn the barren lands of Rayalaseema into garden lands. This can be done only by giving irrigation facilities. Irrigation facilities can be given only by having recourse to projects, and projects mean money. For instance the Tungabhadra project costs us Rs. 18 crores. This sum cannot be got by ordinary means of taxation, but only by a fee like the betterment fee."

Sri P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, is the Hon. Minister prepared to give an undertaking that whatever money is realized

by way of betterment tax will be earmarked only for further irrigation projects and that the amount will not be spent for any other purpose? "

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" I shall answer that at the proper time and place. The hon. Member Mr. Muthiah Chettiyar was speaking about the definition. Definition cannot be a very narrow one. Definition must be such as to include many implications. But that does not mean that the Government are going to levy the betterment tax on small works like deepening a pond, etc. I shall now refer to the Statement of Objects and Reasons. That will clear the position. The Statement of Objects and Reasons says, ' The works that Government have undertaken in the construction, expansion or alteration of irrigation and drainage works have secured to the owners of lands in the area served by such works an increased or more certain supply of water to their lands. It has given varying degrees of benefits to various owners of land as a result of which the market value of the land has either increased or is likely to increase. It is only fair that the Government should be enabled to recover from the owners of the lands so benefited a share of the increase they receive or are likely to receive without any exertion or expenditure on their part.' In an area where a college is opened or a railway station is constructed, the value of the land in that area goes up. Similarly owing to the increased irrigation facilities, the value of the land goes up. Naturally the Government want to take an equitable share. It is not an unreasonable share. I do not know why hon. Members especially hon. Members from Rayalaseema, should object to this levy. A large number of Telugu speeches were made, and I could not follow them fully. But I understood the purport of those speeches. The purport seems to be that Rayalaseema should be helped. I think so, because I heard the word ' Rayalaseema ' uttered by many hon. Members."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" We want that the Hon. Minister should hear that word many more times."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" I want the hon. Member Mr. Nagi Reddi to help me in the Select Committee to make Rayalaseema really fertile. But if he is unreasonable in his attitude, Rayalaseema will only be like what it is at present. The hon. Member Mr. Latchanna referred to the undeveloped areas. I sympathize with him, and I have an eye on the undeveloped areas to give them as many facilities as possible. Some hon. Members were parochial and they asked for extra facilities for their own districts. All these facilities could be given only if this Act finds a place in the Statute Book. I think hon. Members who are not lawyers will depend on lawyers to help them in their deliberations in the Select Committee so that the undeveloped areas in their districts might be developed. The hon. Member Mr. C. V. K. Rao said that the previous Ministry dropped the Bill because they thought that the people were

31st July 1952] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

opposed to it. I may categorically say that the previous Ministry dropped the Bill because they were on the eve of general elections. It is also an established tradition that no important piece of legislation should be brought forward at the fag end of the term of a Ministry. That is why they dropped the Bill and not for the reason alleged by the hon. Member.

" Sir, I am very thankful to the Member of the Socialist party Mr. Anthony Pillai. He has grown more reasonable during the course of a few hours of to-day. I noted the change in his attitude. He does not oppose any taxation proposal as such. His view-point is that if the taxation is scientific and proper, if it does not fall heavily on the poor, and if it will improve the lot of the poor people, he would welcome that measure. I am thankful to him for this. The hon. Member Mr. Koti Reddi also is not opposed to the taxation measure. But he has got certain grievances in regard to minor details. These can be rectified at the Select Committee stage. He wants that the money should be found by some other means.

" I now come to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. He said that he would see that this Bill did not see the light of day just as the previous Bill did not see the light of day. But then there is this difference between the previous Bill and the present Bill. That Bill went that way because there was the dissolution of the Legislature then. Therefore, unless he wants this Legislature to be dissolved—I hope, Sir, he would not take up that attitude—this Bill will not go the way the previous Bill did.

" Sir, I have answered all the points raised against this Bill. I do not know whether the hon. Member Mr. Krishna Rao is on the Select Committee. He is a very tough fighter. I have seen him in the last Select Committee. He will safeguard the interests of all people. I request this House to give its consent to refer the Bill to a Select Committee. We will all discuss this Bill in the Select Committee, and remove the flaws, if any, in the Bill."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' That the Madras Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 5 of 1952), be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following members, and—

' That under rule 81 of the Madras Assembly Rules the leave of the House be granted to have twenty-five Members on the Select Committee ' :—

1. The Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
2. ,, C. Subramaniam.
3. Sri K. Rajaram.
4. ,, P. Ranga Reddi.
5. ,, K. V. Vema Reddi.
6. ,, B. Krishnamurti Rao.
7. ,, T. Ganapathi.

8. Sri A. Appu.
9. ,, P. Chellathurai.
10. ,, K. Shanmugam.
11. ,, T. Anantha Pai.
12. Janab K. K. Mohamed Shafee.
13. Sri M. Venkatasubba Reddi.
14. ,, G. Latchanna.
15. ,, V. Balakrishnan.
16. ,, T. Viswanatham.
17. ,, T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
18. ,, T. Nagi Reddi.
19. ,, C. Kandaswami.
20. ,, M. Veerabhadram.
21. ,, Y. Audinarayana Reddi.
22. ,, V. Sankaranarayana Menon.
23. ,, Lakshminarayana Reddi.
24. ,, A. Govindaswami Nayagar.
25. ,, S. Vemiah.' "

The motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I appoint the Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker to be the Chairman of the Committee."

(5) THE MADRAS LAND REVENUE (SURCHARGE) BILL[a]. 1952.

3-50 p.m. * THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I beg to move—

' That the Madras Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members, and that leave of the House be granted under rule 81 for the Select Committee to consist of more than fifteen persons :—

The Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
,, C. Subramaniam.
Sri K. Rajaram.
Sri P. Venkataswami Reddi.
Sri A. Venkataramaiah.
Sri S. Venkatarama Ayyar.
Sri S. Chinnakaruppa Thevar.
Sri H. Satyanarayana Dora.
Sri P. S. Krishnasamy Ayyangar.
Sri B. Parameswaran.
Sri L. Lakshmana Das.

[a] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 30th July 1952.

31st July 1952] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

Janab K. Uppi.
Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai.
,, *G. Latchanna.*
,, *B. Bhakthavatsalu Naidu.*
,, *T. Viswanatham.*
,, *C. H. Kanaran.*
,, *C. Ramalingiah.*
,, *P. Ramamurthi.*
,, *S. S. Kolkebail.*
,, *M. Narayana Kurup.*
,, *S. Swayamprakasam.*
,, *G. C. Kondiah.*
,, *K. Aranganathan.*
,, *M. Jagannathan.'*

Sir, I think I have to briefly explain the implications of this Bill. I would like to point out to this House that the land revenue system of this State has been subjected to the criticism that the burden of tax is not distributed equitably on the different classes of landowners. Under the existing system persons with large holdings pay the same rate of assessment as the smaller peasants. Further, the richer classes do not bear any additional burden of taxation, even though they are enjoying greater profit than the smaller peasants. In order to remedy this defect and to obtain an addition to the land revenue of the State, it has been decided to levy a surcharge on land revenue assessment. This surcharge would be levied on a rising scale only on the bigger holdings. The Government also consider that the levy of this surcharge on bigger holdings is an element of progression in the land revenue system and is an alternative to agricultural income-tax. Pattadars who pay a land revenue of Rs. 50 and less will be exempted from this surcharge.

" Clause 3 of the Bill provides for this levy on a graduated scale. To prevent large scale fragmentation, as a result of these measures, provision has been made to continue the same scale or scales of surcharge for a period of three years in spite of any partition or alienation of land that may take place after this scale comes into force.

" As we are referring this Bill to a Select Committee for consideration, I need not go into further details. Any suggestions that may be made by the hon. Members will be considered by the Select Committee fully and I request that the House may agree to the suggestion that the report be submitted to this House before the date that may be prescribed by the Hon. Speaker."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I won't fix the date for the submission of the report."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Then the Bill may be referred to the Select Committee."

[31st July 1952

MR. SPEAKER :—" Motion moved—

'That the Madras Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members and that leave of the House be granted under rule 81 for the Select Committee to consist of more than fifteen persons :—

The Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
,, C. Subramaniam.
Sri K. Rajaram.
,, P. Venkataswami Reddi.
,, A. Venkataramaiah.
,, S. Venkatarama Ayyar.
,, S. Chinnakaruppa Thevar.
,, H. Satyanarayana Dora.
,, P. S. Krishnasamy Ayyangar.
,, B. Parameswaran.
,, L. Lakshmana Das.
Janab K. Uppi.
Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai.
,, G. Latchanna.
,, B. Bhakthavatsalu Naidu.
,, T. Viswanatham.
,, C. H. Kanaran.
,, C. Ramalingiah.
,, P. Ramamurthi.
,, S. S. Kolkebail.
,, M. Narayana Kurup.
,, S. Swayamprakasam.
,, G. C. Kondiah.
,, K. Aranganathan.
,, M. Jagannathan.' "

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—" Sir, without prejudice to my future course of action, I do not move my amendment now."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" I do not move my amendment, Sir."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the Statement of Objects and Reasons which the Hon. the Minister for Revenue has been good enough to read, it has been stated that the land revenue system of this State has been subjected to the criticism that the burden is not distributed equitably among the different classes of landowners, that persons with large holdings pay the same rate of assessment, etc., and that in order to remedy this defect and to obtain an addition to the land revenue of the State, it has been decided to levy a surcharge on land revenue assessment. (At this stage, the Deputy Speaker occupied the Chair).

31st July 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

Therefore, this Bill is intended for the seeming purpose of remedying the defect in the existing land revenue system. I would like to ask whether it is really the case that the criticism that has been levelled against the present land revenue system is that the burden is not distributed equitably. Is that the only charge that has been made against the system? On Sunday last, the Hon. the Chief Minister was addressing a meeting in Madras wherein he warned the people assembled there not to be carried away by the exaggerated promises that might be made to them by those people who to-day constituted the Opposition. If we just look back and see what were the promises made by the Congress itself when its members stood for election and by the Hon. Sri Rajagopalachari himself when he was the leader of the Congress, then it would be clear that this was not the only criticism that was made against the existing land revenue system. Then it would also become clear that the boot is on the other leg and that it is not on this leg. I mean the charge of making exaggerated promises to the electorate can very well be brought, not against the Members of the present Opposition, but only against the Congress Party and its Members, including the Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari. For example, ever since 1930 when the famous Karachi Resolution on fundamental rights was passed by the Congress, the Congress had been shouting that the present system of land taxation was a system that had been imposed on this country by the British Government and that it fell very heavily on the poor people. It was not a question of inequitable distribution of the land revenue burden itself but, on the other hand, it was contended that it fell very heavily on the poorer sections of the peasants particularly those peasants who did not have any economic holdings. Therefore, the Congress has been making promises from time immemorial —after all, it was 1930, but I would call it time immemorial— but during the last 25 years it has not seen fit to fulfil those promises. Again and again, the Congress went on saying that the present system of land revenue assessment must be completely changed. For example, it was stated as follows in the agrarian programme which the Congress published on the eve of the elections in 1936—

> 'This Congress is of opinion that the most important and urgent problem of the country is the appalling situation of unemployment and indebtedness of the peasantry, fundamentally due to the antiquated and repressive land tenure and revenue systems and intensified in recent years by a great slump in prices of agricultural produce.'

The same thing is happening today. The misery of the agriculturist has been intensified in recent months by a great slump in the prices of many agricultural commodities, particularly cotton, sugarcane, turmeric, etc. Then, it is said in continuation in the agrarian programme of the Congress—

> 'The final solution of this problem involves the removal of British Imperialistic exploitation, a thorough changing of the land tenure and revenue system and a recognition by the State of its duty to provide for the rural unemployed men.'

" I can thus quote chapter and verse from the Resolutions that have been adopted from time to time by the Congress itself. Now,

three times after the above promise was made, the Congress has been in office. From 1937 to 1939 the Congress was in office. It was again in office from 1946 to 1951. Now in 1952 also it has come into office. Now, I would like to ask : how has the Congress fulfilled that promise? Or, does the Congress Party which is now in office attempt to fulfil that small promise made to the people of this country, to the peasantry of this country, from time to time since 1930? The British Imperialistic exploitation has now been ended. Why does the Congress stick to the same old system of land revenue assessment? Can't the Congress think of a better system? Even when we talk about it, all sorts of obstacles are placed in the way. It was stated by the Hon. Minister, 'The system of agricultural income-tax is certainly an equitable system and we would like to have it, but unfortunately so many obstacles are there in the way. Accounts are not properly kept. It is a very difficult matter to find out how far true accounts are kept by the class of people on whom agricultural income-tax can be imposed.' Sir, is it not a fact that even in the case of merchants and other persons who are to-day subjected to income-tax, false accounts are being maintained and submitted to the authorities concerned? Is it not a fact that a Taxation Enquiry Committee or a Tribunal had to be appointed which unearthed Rs. 16 crores which had been hidden? If that is the case with regard to income-tax from trade and commerce, why should it be so very difficult to assess the income of certain big landlords? Is it a very difficult proposition?

"After all it is well known that if you take the big landlords in Tanjore district or any other district, their accounts can very easily be scrutinized. Their income can very easily be known. We can very easily know what will be the exact rate of waram or kuthagai that they will get. Normally, they get about 5, 10 or 15 kalams per acre, depending on the variety of the land. From this, we can very easily find out what will be the income of these landlords. If only the Government have a heart to assess the income of these landlords, it is very easy to reckon.

"This Bill seems to hit the big landlords. It is stated that people who pay Rs. 1,000 and above are to pay increased land revenue at the rate of 100 per cent. They say, 'Well, look here you people have been telling that the Government are only safeguarding the interests of the landlords. If we were bent upon safeguarding their interests, do you think we would have come with this piece of legislation which will directly hit them very hard?' I say this is purely a deception. Really, the rich landlords are not hit by this Bill. The Government are only trying to deceive the people by saying like that. On the other hand, this is nothing more than bamboozlement in order to prevent the people from knowing the fact, in order to hide the fact from the people. I will give one example. In Tanjore district, there is an estate called Vadapathimangalam Estate, which comprises about 12,000 acres of wet land. If you take this estate, the normal produce under kuthagai is about 15 kalams per acre or 5 kalams per *Ma* as it is called in that part of the State. The

31st July 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

gentleman concerned, who is the owner of this estate, will get about 180,000 kalams per annum. He incurs no expenses, he does not spend anything on cultivation. It is only the kuthagaidar who spends all the money for cultivation. Yet this gentleman gets a net income of 180,000 kalams. Until very recently this gentleman was marketing his paddy, at the rate of Rs. 6¼ per kalam. After decontrol, in the last one or two months, this gentleman is selling his 180,000 kalams of paddy at the rate of Rs. 10½ per kalam and at the rate of Rs. 21 per bag. The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam was telling the other day that the increase in price from Rs. 6¼ to Rs. 10½ is not at all unreasonable. That is the understanding of the Government. Sri Subramaniam represents the Government and therefore he thinks that the increase from Rs. 6¼ to Rs. 10½ is very reasonable. In this manner, the owner of Vadapathimangalam Estate will be getting for his 180,000 kalams of paddy an increased price of about Rs. 7½ lakhs per annum. What is it he is going to pay? He will be paying now a land revenue assessment of about Rs. 75,000, and by means of this surcharge, he is going to pay another rupees 75,000. Against this he is going to get an increase in income of about Rs. 7½ lakhs. That is indeed a very good bargain. How does this Bill hit the big landlord? I am not saying that there should not be decontrol. On the other hand, have decontrol, but see to it that the benefit goes to the people, the benefit goes to the common people, and the benefit goes to the State Government itself. Why don't the Government see to it that the profits go to the poor men and to the Government and not to the landlords? All these attempts on the part of the Government to show that the landlords have been hit hard are nothing more than deception. The entire system of land tax must go. Instead of that, a better system, a more progressive system, a system which is in consonance with all accepted principles of equality must be substituted. It was the British Government who instituted this system of land revenue. Why? They said this was based on principles of equality. The other day, the Hon. Chief Minister was telling us that the British were very just administrators, and that they were just as between the peasants and the landlords, and that they were absolutely fair. On the basis of equality the British Government thought that every peasant owning one or two acres and one owning 1,000 acres of land must pay the same assessment. Why? There is a purpose behind it. The purpose was that the British Government was supporting the system of feudal land-ownership in this country. They thought that only so long as they strengthened the hands of the feudal landlords, and so long as they supported that system of land-ownership they will have stable Government in the country. That is the reason for their supporting the feudal interests. While those people who are making profits from industries and commercial interests are taxed, why should these feudal landowners be treated differently? What is the earthly reason for it? On the other hand, it is a well-known fact that so long as the feudal fetters and feudal relations are maintained in agriculture, you cannot have progress. The history of the entire world, the history of the development

of the capitalistic countries and the history of the industrially developed countries tell us that so long as feudal fetters are maintained, you cannot have development of industry. You cannot develop commerce, because the problem of internal market cannot be solved so long as feudal fetters are there. That is why even in advanced capitalist countries and industrially developed countries like Britain, France and other countries, there had been a revolution against feudalism as such. That is why they were able to achieve industrial prosperity. America achieved it in a different way and I am not concerned with that just now. Here, we have to deal with a class of people who are the real parasites. I refer to the land-owners who are the real parasites in the strictest sense of the word. You cannot say the same with regard to the industrialists. The industrialist has got something to do with production, he buys cotton, he buys machinery, he has to see that the machines are working well and are properly oiled, he has to buy raw material and he has to find a market for his commodity. So far as the feudal land-owners are concerned, they do not bother about the process of cultivation. They do not buy even the seedlings. They do not bother about the cattle. Nor do they help the peasants to get cattle. They do not cultivate the land. As a matter of fact, they do not take any part whatsoever in the process of cultivation. That is why I say that the feudal land-owners are parasites in society. They do not perform any useful function in society, and at the same time are getting enormous money. Why then should there be so much of solicitude for these parasites in society? At present the industrialists are taxed for the margin of profit that they get whereas these parasites, the feudal land-owners, are not taxed in the same manner. Why should there be this differential treatment? Why should the Government treat the merchants and traders in one manner and these feudal land-owners in a different manner? That is why I say that though on the surface it may look as though the land-owners have been hit by the present Bill, in actual practice, it is nothing more than an attempt to postpone for ever the idea of imposing an agricultural income-tax on them. That is the main purpose of this Bill. That is very clear even from the Statement of Objects and Reasons. Similarly, clause 3 (3) says, 'The rate or rates at which surcharge may be levied under this Act in respect of the lands held by a registered holder shall not be diminished by reason of any partition or alienation of the lands or any part thereof which may take place after the 28th June 1952, until the expiry of a period of three fasli years immediately succeeding that in which the partition or alienation takes place . . .' So, you are legislating for this order for the next three years and even more.

4-10 p.m. "Therefore, the object of the Government and the purpose of the Government in bringing forward this legislation is to allay the general feeling that the Government are not giving up the old system of land revenue. They are just trying to bamboozle the people that they are adopting the principles of income-tax in respect of land revenue also. I have said, it looks like that but in reality there is no such thing.

31st July 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

" Sir, it is stated that there are after all about 1,700 people who are paying over thousand rupees as land revenue and that any assessment of the owners of these lands to income-tax will not yield much revenue. It is said that it will yield at best about seventy or eighty lakhs of rupees. I submit that this is not a correct statement of facts. It is all false. I can give instance after instance. Take the Vadapathimangalam Estate. The owner of the estate gets at present an income which would amount to nearly eighteen lakhs of rupees per annum. Now, if he were assessed on the basis of income-tax at the same rates as would be payable by merchants or by an industrialist, he should have to pay tax to the tune of nearly thirteen lakhs of rupees. Now the Government want to keep this thirteen lakhs with him and take just about one and a half lakhs of rupees and nothing more than that. I can give instances in tens and hundreds wherein the Government can hope to get ten thousands and fifteen thousands by way of income-tax on land. For example, take the case of Kapisthalam Mooppanar who owns five thousand acres of fertile land in Papanasam taluk. He is paying about fifty thousand rupees per annum as assessment on an yield of 45 kalams per acre which is much more than what the Vadapathimangalam Estate yields. In the whole of Tanjore, there are a number of small landlords. But the whole district is in the hands of a few big landlords and four mutts like Thiruvaduthurai Adhinam and others. The whole lands are held by these people and if we really assess them on the basis of income-tax, I can assure you, Sir, that the total income from Tanjore district alone will not be less than five crores of rupees. But the Government do not want to do it. Similarly, take the plantations. The Subramaniam Committee has suggested the equalisation of taxation in plantations. There are people, the Committee has said, who pay between twelve annas and two rupees and eight annas, and make an average of the whole thing and assess them at the rate of Rs. 1-8-0 per acre. Now, Sir, take the coffee plantations and the tea plantations. I know some of my friends like Mr. Ari Gowder and other Indian tea planters are in distress and suffering because they are pushed down by a few select British shots. But if you look into the accounts of these British shots, you will find that last year, they were able to get an income at the rate of five hundred rupees per acre on tea plantations. Their income has been increasing year by year. Now they are pretending that they are not able to get as much profits. I am not going to be deceived by that story. The tea planters are getting five hundred rupees per acre and coffee planters are getting, not five hundred rupees, but eight hundred to one thousand rupees per acre. Yet coffee prices are going up. Why should these coffee planters be assessed at the rate of Rs. 2-8-0? They are not at all going to be affected by this surcharge. Only very few will be affected. Only those who own more than twenty acres may have to pay and the owners of these plantations will get away easily by simply reducing the extent to nineteen acres, giving away one acre to somebody else. While they are going to escape this levy thus, the ordinary peasant, the middle-class peasant, who owns three and a half acres

of wet land in Tanjore or Coimbatore and who is assessed at the rate of sixteen or eighteen rupees will be subjected to this surcharge. Now, take the Kannivadi plantations. What is the assessment on these plantations? It is only four annas per acre and today, you know the price of bananas. My friend, Dr. Soundaram Ramachandran, who had been to that place the other day, would have found that the assessment is only four annas or, I might be making a small mistake, it will be six annas. How is this levy going to affect these plantations? What is the surcharge that is going to be made on the rich pannai lands which the pannai zamindar has got? There are about hundred acres of land on which plantains are grown. How is it going to affect him? It will not affect him and it should not affect him because he is a feudal landlord. Therefore, under this system, the rich and feudal landlords get away scotfree. The money-lenders get away scotfree. It is the ordinary people, the middle-class people, the poor peasants, that are going to pay this. And we are told that this is a very good measure and the tax is going to hit the rich landlords most while the Communist party and people who belong to that party are not satisfied with that. This is what the Government say. Therefore, it is no wonder that the landlords have supported this measure. Mr. Rajagopalachari told us the other day at a meeting in the City that the landlords were very good people and that they had supported the Government and the people in having agreed to the new measures of taxation. I know the Government have on the one hand made it possible for them to get more money and on the other hand, protect them by making provision for a big Police force to prevent the peasants from fighting them. While they promise that something will be done at some future date, what is it that they are doing immediately? Immediately, a Police force is sent there; what for? To ensure equality between the landlord and the peasants, and to bring about justice. Mr. Rajagopalachari was frank in his statement this morning. He was caught napping when he said that the Police will be on that side which tempts them. We know what this equality is. Here is a landlord who is able to get eighteen lakhs of rupees per annum and here is the peasant who does not get even one rupee per day for even three months in a year. The Police is there to restore equality between these two. Who will be able to tempt the Police, the man who gets eighteen lakhs or the man who cannot get even a rupee per day for three months in a year? Now the Chief Minister tells the peasant, 'you can also tempt the Police' We know who can tempt the Police. We know who can buy the Police. Why should landlords object to this levy when they know full well that when they want, the Police force will be sent for the purpose of protecting them from the peasants? They will agree to this and they will pay it for their own protection. How exactly they are protected, we know. I know when the rich landlord and the peasant go to the court, they will be 'equal' there. But the big man will be able to engage Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar and the poor man will have to shout out his case. The Chief Minister may ask, who prevents the poor man from engaging Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar. Of course, he is not

31st July 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

prevented from engaging him. But can he engage? Where is the means for him to engage? And we are told everybody is equal. Therefore, Sir, the landlords today welcome this for this reason, that is, for their own protection. On the other hand, if the Government are really anxious to hit the landlords and see that equality prevails and justice prevails, then I would submit that they should scrap this Bill and substitute it by another Bill which will provide for a rigorous, upgraded, steeply upgraded system of agricultural income-tax by which they will be able to get, not this seventy or eighty lakhs of rupees which they hope to get by the surcharge on land revenue, but not less than fifteen crores of rupees. I promise to get them that amount. Therefore, I submit that this Bill should not be accepted on its face value. There is something behind it and I hope the Select Committee will go into the principles of the Bill thoroughly, delve deeper into the whole thing and expose the real purpose behind this Bill and fight for a better system of taxation."

RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR OF CHETTINAD :—" Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, following my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramamurthi, on this question . . ." (Interruption.) 4-20 p.m.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" I was asking whether the hon. Member was following me in my footsteps."

RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR OF CHETTINAD :—" What shall I say in reply to the golden words that have fallen from the mouth of my hon. Friend expecting me to follow in his footsteps? I can only hope . . ."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" I didn't say that. I don't want the hon. Member to follow in my footsteps."

RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR OF CHETTINAD :—" I can never imagine my hon. Friend would go to the extent of asking me to follow in his footsteps. I will only say that since he is here at last, he would follow in the footsteps of some of us rather than ask us to follow him.

" Sir, I was just saying that following the speech made by my hon. Friend Mr. Ramamurthi this afternoon I was wondering whether I was handicapped by it or not. I only heard a few words of his speech objecting to this measure and saying that plantations were left free without any taxation. I would only wish to remind the hon. House that the question of taxing the plantations is quite a different affair from the question of levying a surcharge on wet lands. As a matter of fact I am one who still feels that the Government have to re-examine the entire tax structure with reference to the land tax. I do not think the last word has been said as to the system of land tax that should prevail here. We are accustomed to the old system which by itself is not a bad thing. Probably on account of the regular system of land revenue, and the attachment the people have towards lands, they feel that the land tax is not an abominable thing, and they are able to produce something out of the land. It is only in certain years when

[Raja Muthiah Chettiyar of Chettinad] [31st July 1952

there has not been sufficient produce due to failure of rains or when there is a fall in prices, that the people feel the pinch of the tax. Even during such periods if Government come forward and grant remissions they feel quite happy. The land revenue system of our country is the backbone of the administration. That is why I have been pleading that this old established system and its administration by the Board of Revenue should be continued and strengthened, and the present members of the Board should be retained. I believe, of all the systems of land revenue, ours is the finest system. We may have complaints, but they cannot be classed as complaints against the system as such.

"Now, Sir, the question is whether the surcharge on land revenue is just or not. With regard to the plantations, I can only say, if the time comes when this House and the other Assemblies in this part of the country can agree on a sort of income-tax to be levied on these plantations, suitable legislation could be passed. That is a different matter. Thanks to the genius of the statesman, Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar, Travancore, has been able to make the land tax an agreeable tax. There is a feeling in that part of the country, Travancore-Cochin, that unless the man pays at least half-a-rupee as tax on land he will not be able to claim ownership of the land. We want some kind of tax to be levied on the land. That is the mentality of the people. Let me give you an example of it. The Chettiyars re-entered Burma in 1946. Taxation was levied on land on the alleged cultivation of land by other people, before we re-entered Burma. My firm protested against the taxation and did not pay the tax. All the other 1,499 firms paid the tax. Therefore I was penalised for it. My agent was arrested and kept in the lock-up for some days. But apology came from high officials for the mistake committed by the department. Ultimately we had to pay the tax on other grounds. Therefore the land tax is not an abominable thing. But the only question is whether agricultural income-tax can replace this tax.

" Sir, in Ceylon there is no land tax as such. There is a small quit-rent fixed per acre. There are big estates, coconut estates, tea estates, rubber estates and all that. The minimum fixed there is very good. I am referring to Ceylon with a purpose because I am going to refer to the minimum fixed under this Bill. There are also agricultural lands in Ceylon. Ceylon produces about a third of its requirements of rice. The holdings are not big and the income from the lands will be within the exemption limit. Therefore the other taxes relating to the rubber, tea, coconut and other plantations come under income-tax and do not affect the small holdings. Till the time when an agricultural income-tax comes into being and the present land tax goes, probably our Government have thought of this surcharge on land revenue. But there cannot be any question of these taxes going together. As soon as the Government decide on taxing the agricultural incomes, both these must go. Till that time comes we have to keep the State going and for that Government want money. The Government must one day or other take up the whole question and give

serious consideration. (Interruption.) I said 'one day or the other' instead of fixing any time-limit such as a year or two, because Government might be enabled to take up the question even to-morrow. Even the question of taxing the plantations has been taken up in the meantime. Government are thinking of the levy of an agricultural income-tax on plantations. The planters may not object to the tax as such and even if they do, what chance is there for them to stop the passing of such a legislation here? It is not possible.

"In this connexion, I would request the Government to give an estimate of the revenue they expect to derive from this levy. I do not think that has been furnished to us, by the Hon. Minister. If this information is furnished it would enable us to suggest what amount of revenue must be exempted from the levy of surcharge. I understand that if a substantial minimum is allowed free, then the income from the levy will not be large. If that is so, Government must consider whether it is worth while at all to levy this surcharge. 'The Government of India have not come to the aid of this State and that is why this levy is proposed' is the argument of Government, on which I have already spoken on the floor of this House. But one thing about which I am sure is this. The exemption limit of Rs. 50 is not at all a sufficient margin. This is the general feeling among the people and I put it before the Government for consideration. Whatever might be the decision of the Government I am prepared to agree, but Government must consider the question of raising the exemption limit to as high a figure as possible. This exemption limit of Rs. 50 will benefit only those who own only 6 to 7 acres of land. After all I am not pleading for the big zamindars or feudal landlords. I have spoken in support of the abolition of zamindaris all these ten years. My hon. Friend Mr. Viswanatham will bear me out, when I say this."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"I would like to tell my hon. Friend that feudalism does not mean only the zamindari systems. As a matter of fact, in England and other places, there were no zamindars. Still there was feudal landlordism. This connotes a different economic category, a category in which the land owner does not perform any function with regard to production, but on the other hand he is just a receiver of rent by virtue of the fact that he happens to be the owner of the land. This is feudal land ownership."

RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR OF CHETTINAD :—"I am very grateful to the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi for the connotation of the word 'feudal landlordism.' I agree with him. The zamindar also was a feudal landlord in our country and probably he was a worse feudal landlord than the landlord Mr. Ramamurthi has referred to. Perhaps he has in mind the mirasdars of Tanjore and East Godavari. I know the mirasdars of our State. They are not feudal landlords; they are not sleeping landlords; if they are sleeping, no production is possible. To-day the tiller of the soil has not got even the means to till the land. I know the 4-30 p.m.

mirasidars of Tanjore, Tiruchirappalli, Salem and other districts and I may tell from my experience with them that they are not sleeping landlords. If we go from place to place we will find the tillers asking the mirasidars to remain because they want the mirasidars to advance them money for buying cattle and other purposes. Therefore, Sir, there is no such thing as feudal landlordism at all now. It might have been the case thirty or sixty years ago when cattle was very cheap. Therefore my friend Mr. P. Ramamurthi should not say that all the landlords in our country are feudal landlords; they are working on their lands, and if they don't work they will incur debts. I know many mirasidars are unable to send their boys to colleges. That is the real position of landlords to-day."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" Sir, the hon. Member is deviating from the subject."

RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR OF CHETTINAD :—" Sir, the other 300 and odd Members here do not share the view that the hon. Member has got.

" Therefore, Sir, I may be permitted to say that the exemption limit of Rs. 50 is not just and that it must be raised. I would ask the Government to seriously consider this suggestion and of course I will vote with them whatever the position may be. (Sri T. Viswanathan : ' Hear, hear.) I hope the hon. Leader of the Opposition is a member of the Select Committee and I expect him to convince the other Members about the necessity for raising the exemption limit. A few lakhs of rupees this side or that side does not matter, but we must convince the Government of the rightness of the cause. Therefore, Sir, I would request the Government to exempt the owners of 5 to 7 acres from this surcharge and also give some consideration even in the maximum limit."

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—" Sir, I rise to oppose the Bill and at the same time make it clear that it is not the principle as such that I am opposed to. The principle, of course; of graded taxation is there and it is mentioned in the Bill in laudable terms. Why do I oppose this? Before supporting or approving any taxation Bill, one must be convinced first that the money collected will be spent for proper necessities. The experience of a month's debate and discussion here has not given me that hope that the money they propose to collect will be spent for the amelioration of the toiling sections of the people. Sir, the Hon. Chief Minister has said this morning, ' Whenever taxation proposals come, you oppose them; but, at the same time you go on speaking about raising the scales of pay.' Sir, he referred to our demand that the meagre salaries of police constables must be raised; he said that we were opposing the taxation proposals and at the same time demanding increased salaries. Sir, I would like to put one question straightaway to the Hon. Chief Minister. Did he consider any constructive proposal made from this side during this one month debate to improve the living conditions of the toiling sections of our people? He did not concede even a single demand. So, Sir, he has not given us any hope that the

31st July 1952] [Sri M. Hanumantha Rao]

money that is to be collected would be spent to ameliorate the conditions of the toiling masses. That is why, Sir, I am opposed to this taxation proposal. On the other hand, I am afraid that the money would be spent more and more on repressing the people. There is justification for my apprehension, Sir. Yesterday morning, while answering a question on the Preventive Detention Bill of the Central Government, the Hon. the Chief Minister spoke in such a way that the inference could be drawn from the answer, that the Government of Madras have recommended the passing of the Preventive Detention Bill by the Central Government. Sir, when the situation in the country does not warrant such a Bill . . ."

DEPUTY SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member is deviating from the subject under discussion."

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—" I know, Sir. I am only referring to the way in which the money is going to be spent. The Hon. Chief Minister this morning again made it clear that he must always keep the powder dry. When the situation does not warrant it and when the conditions do not ask for it, he wants to keep always his powder dry and in order to keep his powder dry, the people of this State are asked to pay more and more taxes. That is why, Sir, I oppose this Bill.

" Sir, in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, it is said—

'The land revenue system of this State has been subjected to the criticism that the burden is not distributed equitably among the different classes of land owners. Persons with large holdings pay the same rate of assessment as the smaller peasants. The richer classes do not bear any additional burden of taxation. In order to remedy this defect and to obtain an addition to the land revenue of the State, Government have, in the absence of any agricultural incometax, decided to levy with effect from fasli 1362, a surcharge on land revenue assessments which will be levied on a rising scale on the bigger holdings.'

Sir, I fail to understand how this type of taxation is going to relieve the burden on the ordinary peasant. Sir, we have been all the while propagating that there must be graded taxation and that persons owning below 5 acres must be exempted from this taxation.

" This Bill does not relieve the poor peasant who owns three or four acres or even five acres from the burden of taxation. On the other hand even a man who is owning four or five acres in wet areas is forced to pay these taxes. That is why, Sir, the main burden is again falling not on the rich landlords but on those poor sections of the peasantry who own from 4 acres to 10 acres. Already these people are struggling to make a living. They are not in a position to bear any additional burden. Even though at first appearance, the Statement of Objects and Reasons appears laudable, in reality the Bill is not helping the poor but only the rich landlords. 4-40 p.m

" I do not know the reason why this Government has been refusing to consider the question of raising the minimum of land revenue from Rs. 50 to Rs. 100 or Rs. 150 to levy surcharge in spite of the popular demand to raise the land revenue level to Rs. 100 or Rs. 150. The Hon. Minister had also told that the

Government could not agree to raising the level of land revenue to more than Rs. 50. Why are the Government refusing to raise the minimum? It is because of the fact that if they do so, those rich landlords who pay a land revenue of between thousand and two thousand rupees will be obliged to pay more. But the Government are very anxious to protect the rich landlords. On the basis of the present fixation of Rs. 50 as the minimum land revenue level, I think most of the tax burden will fall on the poor agriculturists. They are already over-burdened with taxation. This defect in the Bill should be removed.

" As I had already stated I am not against the principle of the Bill. But the way in which it seeks to levy the tax has to be changed. That is why I am pleading that the exemption limit should be raised to at least Rs. 150. While opposing the proposed method of taxation generally, I wish to observe that I agree to the proposal to refer this Bill to the Select Committee."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member's time is up."

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—" But, I hope the Select Committee will not come to a decision in a hurry. I wish that they invite public opinion and consult public opinion before coming to a decision on this Bill and that the Select Committee will not find it necessary at all to bring back this Bill to this House."

* **SRI C. KANDASWAMY** :—" கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, நிலவரி மீது ஸர்சார்ஜ் விதிப்பதற்காகக் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்கும் மசோதாவை எதிர்த்துச் சில வார்த்தைகள் சொல்ல முன்வந்திருக்கின்றேன். ஏற்கனவே பேசிய எனது நண்பர் கனம் ராமமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் இதைப்பற்றி விரிவாகப் பேசி விட்டார். இருப்பினும்கூட நானும் சில வார்த்தைகள் சொல்ல வேண்டியிருக்கிறது.

" முதலாவதாக, இன்றிருக்கின்ற நிலவரி முறையை எந்தப் பக்கத்தில் இருக்கின்ற அங்கத்தினர்களும் ஆதரிக்கமாட்டார்களென்பது தெரியும். அதுமட்டுமல்ல. இன்றிருக்கும் டியான நிலவரி முறையை மாற்றிவிட வேண்டுமென்ற கூக்குரல் நீண்ட நாளாகவே இருக்கிறதென்பதும் எல்லோருக்கும் தெரிந்த விஷயம்.

" அடுத்தபடியாக, இன்றிருக்கக்கூடிய, நிலவரி முறைக்குப் பதிலாக வருமான அடிப்படையில் படிப்படியாக ஏறக்கூடிய வருமான வரி போடப்படவேண்டுமென்பது எல்லோராலும் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளப்படுகிறது. இந்த மசோதாவின் கடைசியில் " Statement of Objects and Reasons " இலும் அது ஒப்புக்கொள்ளப்படுகிறது. அப்படியிருக்கும்போது, வருமானத்தின் அடிப்படையில் படிப்படியாக ஏறக்கூடிய வருமான வரி விதிப்பதில் நியாயம் இருக்கிறதென்று ஒப்புக்கொள்ளக் கூடிய நிலைமையில், ஏன் பழைய, எல்லோ ராலும் கண்டிக்கப்படுகிற, அநியாய மானது என்று கூறப் டுகிற, இந்த land tax அடிப்படையில் இந்த வரி விதிக்க படுகிறதென்பதை சிந்தனை யெய்து பார்க்கவேண்டும்.

" இதைச் செய்திருக்கும்போது, ஒரு கல்லில் இரண்டு மாங்காய் அடித்த வித்தையைத் தான் இந்த மந்திரிசபையார் கையாளுகிறார்களென்று நான் நினைக்கிறேன். ஒன்று, தங்களுடைய பட்ஜெட்டில் துண்டு விழுவதைச் சரிக்கட்டிக் கொள்வதற்கும், இரண்டாவது, அதே சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் எங்கு பா த்தாலும் நிலவருமான அடி படையில் "வரி விதிப்பு இருக்கவேண்டுமென்ற கூக்குர லுக்கு, கண் துடைப்பதுபோலவும் இருக்கிறது. இரண்டு நோக்கங்களையும் பூர்த்தி செய்யும்படியாக இருக்கவேண்டு

31st July 1952] [Sri C. Kandaswamy]

மென்பதற்காக இந்த வரியைக் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறார்கள் என்று நினைக்கின்றேன். இது எந்த விதத்திலும் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளக்கூடியதல்ல என்பதுதான் என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம்.

" வருமானத்தை அடிப்படையாகக் கொண்டு வரி போடுவதற்கும், இன்று இருக்கக்கூடிய நிலவரியை அடிப்படையாகக் கொண்டு போடுவதற்கும் எவ்வளவு வித்தியாசம் இருக்கிறதென்பது கனம் அங்கத்தினர் ராமமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் எங்கள் ஜில்லாவில் இருக்கக்கூடிய ஒரு நிலச்சுவான்தாருடைய வருமானத்தை அடிப்படையாகக்கொண்டு நன்றாக எடுத்துக்காட்டினார். ஏதாவது ஒரு வரி அதிகரிக்கப்பட்டாலும் நிலப் பிரபுக்கள் ஏகமாகக் கூச்சலிடுவது வழக்கமாக இருந்து வருகிறது. ஆனால், சமீபத்தில் இந்த வரி வரப்போகிறது என்று அறிவிக்கப்பட்ட பிறகு, தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள நிலப் பிரபுக்கள் அதிகமாக அமர்க்களம் செய்யவில்லையென்பதை இந்தச் சபையின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன்.

" கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள், தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள நிலப் பிரபுக்களையெல்லாம் ஒன்றுகூட்டி, தனியாகப் பேச்சு வார்த்தை நடத்தினார் என்பதையும் இந்தச் சபையின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவருகின்றேன். நிலப் பிரபுக்களை மட்டும் கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் கூப்பிட்டார்களேயொழிய, சிறு நிலக்காரர்களையும் சிறு பட்டாதார்களையும், 50 ரூபாய்க்கு மேல் 150 அல்லது 200 ரூபாய்க்குள் கிஸ்தி செலுத்தக் கூடியவர்களையும் கூப்பிட்டுப் பேசினார்களா என்பதை நான் தெரிந்துகொள்ள முடியவில்லை. அவர்களையெல்லாம் கூப்பிட்டு, 'சர்க்கார் de-ration செய்துவிட்டார்களே! அதனால் உங்களுடைய நெல்லுக்கு நல்ல விலை கிடைப்பதால், உங்களுக்கு வருமானம் அமோகமாக வரக்கூடுமே! ஆகையால் நாங்கள் போடும் புதிய வரிகளை உங்களால் கொடுக்கமுடியுமா?' என்பதாகவெல்லாம், அமோகமாக இருக்கும் பட்டாதார்கள் அத்தனை பேரையும் கூப்பிட்டு நியாயத்தை அவர்களுக்கு வற்புறுத்திச் சொல்லி, அவர்களை ஒப்புக் கொள்ளும்படி செய்வதற்கு, கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் அவர்களிடம் பேச்சு வார்த்தைப் பரிவர்த்தனைகள் நடந்திருக்கின்றனவா என்று கேட்க ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். சிறு நில விவசாயிகளுக்குள் எவ்வளவோ கஷ்டங்கள் இருக்கின்றன. 100, 150, 200 ரூபாய் கிஸ்தி செலுத்தக்கூடிய அவிபக்த குடும்பங்கள் இருக்கின்றன. அவர்களுக்கு வருமானம என்ன? அவர்களுக்கு கஷ்டங்கள் என்ன? அதிக வரிப் பளுவைத் தாங்குவதற்கு அவர்களுக்குச் சக்தி இருக்கிறதா? என்பதைப்பற்றி விசாரணை செய்யப் பட்டதா என்று நான் கேட்க ஆசைப்படுகிறேன்.

" கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் மிகுந்த புத்திசாலியாக இருப்பினும்கூட, ஆயிரம் ஏகர் நிலம் வைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கும் நிலப்பிரபுக்களைக் கூப்பிட்டு கலந்து பேசினாரேயொழிய, தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் இருக்கும்படியான லக்ஷக் கணக்கான சிறு பட்டாதார்களை அவர்கள் கலந்து பேசியதாகத் தெரியவில்லை. லக்ஷக் கணக்காக இருக்கும் சிறு பட்டாதார்கள் தான் இந்த Bill இன் தலைவிதியை நிர்ணயிக்கப் போகிறார்களென்பதை அவர்களுக்கு எடுத்துக்காட்ட விரும்புகின்றேன். அவர்கள்தான் முதுகெலும்புபோல் இருக்கக்கூடியவர்கள். அந்தச் சிறு பட்டாதார்களையும் கலந்து பேசவேண்டும் என்பதை இந்தச் சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்களுக்கு வற்புறுத்திச் சொல்ல ஆசைப்படுகின்றேன்.

" Feudalism என்பதைப்பற்றி கனம் அங்கத்தினர் ராமமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் எடுத்துச் சொன்னார். நிலப்பிரப்புக்கள் சோம்பேறிகளாகவும் புல்லுருவி களாகவும் இருந்துகொண்டு, தாங்கள் விவசாயத்திற்கு ஒன்றுமே பாடு படாமல் எப்படி சம்பாதித்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள் என்பதைப்பற்றி அவர் குறிப்பிட்டார். அதைப்பற்றி ஒரு வாதம் நடந்தது. அந்தப் பக்கத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய கனம் ராஜா முத்தையா செட்டியார் அவர்கள் சொல்லியதற்குப் பதில் சொல்லுகிறேன். நான் இதைச் சொல்லும்போது ஒரு ஜாதியைப்பற்றியோ வேறு எதைப்பற்றியுமோ குறிப்பிடுவதாக யாரும் நினைக்கக்கூடாது. செட்டியார் வகுப்பைச் சேர்ந்தவர்களில் சிலருக்கு 1,500 ஏகர் நிலம் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் இருக்கிறது. நூற்றுக்கணக்கான செட்டியார் களுக்கு ஆயிரம் ஏக்கர், 500 ஏக்கர், 150 ஏக்கர் நிலம் இருக்கிறது. அவர்

[Sri C. Kandaswamy] [31st July 1952

களுக்கும் நிலத்திற்கும் சம்பந்தம் இல்லை. கணக்குப் பிள்ளைகள் இருக்கிறார்கள். கணக்குப் பிள்ளைகளுக்கு சம்பளம் கொடுக்கின்றார்கள் என்பது வாஸ்தவம். தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள குடியானவர்கள் ' நிலப் பிரபுக்கள் இருக்கவேண்டும் ' என்று பல இடங்களில் கூக்குரலிடுகிறார்கள் என்று கனம் ராஜா முத்தையா செட்டியார் சொல்லும்போது, 1952-ம் வருஷத்தில் அவர்கள் வசிக்கவில்லையென்று நினைக்கின்றேன்.

" எங்கு பார்த்தாலும், tenancy legislation வேண்டும், நில உரிமை வேண்டும், நில பாத்தியதை வேண்டும், வாரம், குத்தகை குறைக்கப்பட வேண்டும், ஒரு நவீன உலகத்தில் வசிக்கவேண்டும் என்றெல்லாம் மக்கள் நினைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கும் போது, இந்த தேசத்தில், 85 சத விகிதம் இருக்கக்கூடிய, இந்த தேசத்தின் தலைவிதியை நிர்ணயிக்கக்கூடிய, விவசாயிகளுக்கு உற்சாகத்தை அளிக்கக்கூடிய வகையில் நிலச் சீர்திருத்தம் செய்யப்படவேண்டும் என்பதை யாரும் மறுக்க முடியாது. அப்படியிருக்கும்போது, ' நிலப்பிரபுக்கள் இருக்கவேண்டும் என்று விவசாயிகள் சொல்லுகிறார்கள் ; நிலப் பிரபுக்கள் கடன் கொடுத்து உதவுகிறார்கள் ; விவசாயிகள் அதைச் செய்யவேண்டும், இதைச் செய்யவேண்டும் என்று நிலப் பிரபுக்களைக் கேட்கிறார்கள் ' என்றெல்லாம் கூப்பாடு போட்டுக் கொண்டிருந்தால், அதைக் குடியானவர்கள் நம்புகிறதாயில்லை. கனம் ராஜா முத்தையா செட்டியார் அவர்கள் இதைச் சொல்லும்போது ஆகாயத்தில் இருந்து கொண்டுதான் பேசுகிறார்கள் என்று நினைக்கவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. கடன் சும்மா கொடுத்து விடுகிறார்களா ? என்று நான் கேட்கிறேன். சாகுபடிக்கு விதைக்கு, தாளடிக் கூலிக்கு ரொக்கமாகக் கொடுத்தால், அறுவடை காலத்தில் $1\frac{1}{2}$ வட்டி போட்டு வாங்கிக் கொள்ளுகிறார்கள். கலம் ஒன்றுக்கு 4 மரக்கால் வட்டி கொடுக்கிறார்கள். அதாவது 33% வட்டி ஆகின்றது. ஆகையால், இனமாக ஒன்றும் கொடுத்துவிடவில்லை. ஆயிரக்கணக்கான ஏகர் நிலம் சாகுபடிக்கு எடுத்துக் கொள்ளப்படவில்லை. விவசாயிகள் இன்றைய தினம் உற்சாகமில்லாமல் இருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த தேசத்தில் 85 சத விகிதம் இருக்கக்கூடிய விவசாயிகளின் உற்சாகத்தை நாசம் செய்து, குடும்பத்தை அழிக்கிறார்கள். விவசாயிகள் அழிந்து கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள் என்பதை நான் இன்று எடுத்துக்காட்ட விரும்புகின்றேன்.

4-50 p.m. " ஆகவே, இந்த வரி விதிப்பானது, வருமான அடிப்படையில் படிப்படியாக ஏறக்கூடியதாக இருந்தாலொழிய, இந்தக் கண்துடைப்பு வித்தையானது, இன்றைக்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய கிஸ்தி முறையை அடிப்படையாகக் கொண்டு வரிவிதிப்பானது ஒரு நாளும் பலிக்கப்போவதில்லை. தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில், சரித்திரம் தோன்றிய நாள் முதலாக, கலம் 10 ரூபாய் என்று விற்றதே கிடையாது. கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் காலத்தில் தான் இருக்கிறதென்று நான் நினைக்கிறேன். கலம் 5 ரூபாய்க்கு மேல் விற்றதே இல்லை. தஞ்சை ஜில்லா சரித்திரத்திலேயே இப்பொழுதுதான் கலம் 10 ரூபாய் என்று நெல் விற்கப்படுகிறது. இந்த நிலை நிரந்தரமாக, குறைந்த பக்ஷம் 2 அல்லது 3 வருஷங்களாவது, நீடித்திருக்கும் என்பது நிச்சயம்.

" இப்பொழுதிருக்கும் நிலைமையில், இந்த சர்சார்ஜ் பெரிய மிராசுதாரர்களைப் பாதிக்கப் போவதேயில்லை. சிறிய மிராசுதாரர்களைத் தான் பாதிக்கப் போகிறது. பெரிய மிராசுதாரர்கள், குத்தகைக்காரர்களின் தலையில் இதைச் சுமத்திவிடுவார்கள். அதனால், நில வெளியேற்றம் ஏற்படப்போகிறது. தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் ஒரு பெரிய குழப்பம் ஏற்படப்போகிறது. ' இது கடைசி வார்த்தையல்ல ' என்று கனம் ராஜா முத்தையா செட்டியார் அவர்கள் குறிப்பிட்டார்கள் நான் கூறுகிறேன். இங்கு நடக்கக்கூடிய விவாதம் கடைசி வார்த்தை அல்ல. கடைசி வார்த்தை சொல்வது யார் என்று கேட்டால், இன்றைய தினம் உடல் உழைத்து, கஷ்டப்பட்டு, நடுச் சந்தியில் திண்டாடிக்கொண்டிருக்கும் அவர்கள் தான் கடைசி வாக்கு சொல்லப் போகிறார்கள். அவர்கள் கடைசி வாக்கு சொல்வதற்கு ஒரு காலம் வரப் போகிறது. இந்த Bill ஆனது அடிப்படையிலேயே மிக மோசமாக இருக்கிறது. ஆகையால், இதை வன்மையாகக் கண்டித்து எதிர்க்கவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. "

MR. SPEAKER :—" I fix a time-limit of five minutes for each speaker."

31st July 1952]

SRI S. JAYARAMA REDDIAR :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, in introducing the Bill, the Hon. Revenue Minister said that it would remove the inequality that exists between the bigger landholder and the smaller landholder. I do not think that the inequality can be removed by levying this surcharge. I am a landlord coming from a dry tract. There are big landlords like the Raja of Kapileswarapuram or the Zamindar of Vadapathimangalam who have an assured supply of water for their lands. I own an equal extent of land as a big mirasdar. Last year I had some income. But this year, owing to the failure of the monsoon, I am incurring a loss. How does the Hon. Minister say that by inflicting this surcharge, he is doing justice to me? Those landholders, who have assured supply of water, are not at all suffering. On the other hand, on account of decontrol of foodgrains, they are getting a higher price for their produce. But the landlords in dry tracts are incurring a loss in agriculture. Such inequalities are existing. I do not think the Government have taken a serious view of the anomalies prevailing in the country. The Government will do well to consider this point at least in the Select Committee stage of this Bill.

" I think agricultural income-tax is the only just form of taxation. In the industrial field, a minimum income is exempted and the income in excess of that minimum is assessed to income-tax on a graded scale. Whoever gets an income is made to pay to the Government in proportion to his income. Why should not the same principle be applied to the agricultural field also? As Mr. P. Ramamurthi pointed out, an absentee landlord who gets *varam* is made to pay a tax but it is not as much as the income-tax levied in other fields.

" I think the Government will take all these facts into serious consideration. My point is to stress the difficulties to which the landlords in dry tracts will be put to on account of this new tax. I think the infliction of this tax is a very serious thing which they will oppose tooth and nail."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Sri G. Latchanna."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" I am not speaking on this Bill. Sri K. V. Ramesam will speak."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Sri K. V. Ramesam."

SRI K. V. RAMESAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am thankful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak on this Bill and also to Mr. Latchanna for allowing me this chance."

MR. SPEAKER :—" It is not Mr. Latchanna but the Speaker that allows."

SRI K. V. RAMESAM :—" I speak subject to correction.

" There is fragmentation of holdings in our State. That is due to our laws of inheritance, succession and partition. Fragmentation of holdings has been going on from time immemorial and the result is that there are very small and uneconomic holdings.

[Sri K. V. Ramesam] [31st July 1952

Most of the burden of this tax will fall on the tenants who are cultivating these fragmented blocks. Therefore I submit that this system of taxation must go and in its place, as has been suggested by several hon. Members, agricultural income-tax should be introduced. I would like to place before the House certain facts which would support the view I take. Those who raise cash-crops like sugarcane, tobacco and chillies, make a huge profit. Those who raise food-crops cannot get the same amount of profit. The cost of cultivation in both the cases is more or less the same. Some of the previous speakers referred to the produce of garden lands. Those who raise garden produce like plantains, oranges, etc., make a huge profit. In some places, an acre of garden land yields an income of Rs. 20,000. The growers of tea, coffee, coconut, etc., plantations also make a huge profit. Under the proposed method of levying surcharge, those who raise cash and garden crops and make huge profit will have to pay the same amount as the growers of food-crops. There is a vast disparity between their profits. We will be doing a great injustice to the growers of food-crops like paddy, ragi, cumbu, cholam, etc. These are the essential crops which we have to raise to sustain ourselves. The most serious problem to-day is the food problem. To solve it, my suggestion is to completely exempt from the payment of any tax whatsoever, the growers of food-crops whose extent of land is within a specified limit. Agricultural income-tax may be levied on landlords who own vast extents of land, and the growers of cash and garden crops who earn a huge profit. I submit that the growers of commercial crops should be made to pay more tax than the growers of food-crops.

5 p.m. "It was pointed out by the Hon. Minister that there was difficulty in accounting. I submit that that difficulty would arise only in the case of small and petty landholders. Take the case of the big landlords, for instance, people who are owning coffee plantations, tea plantations, orange gardens, and other plantations where cash crops are raised. In the case of these people accounting difficulty will not arise. What I suggest is the most equitable and just method. Exemption to small landholders should be given.

"One other point I would like to submit to the Government, Sir. Particularly in the zamindari areas of Visakhapatnam and Srikakulam, the rent per acre of wet land is more than Rs. 20 including cesses. Therefore, if one is in possession of three to four acres of land, one will be obliged to pay Rs. 60 or so. He is in a worse position compared to the cultivator in the delta area. If we look into the actual figures, this will become evident. My submission, therefore, is that this tax will work great hardship on the zamindari tenants. Most of the estates are taken over by the Government. This tax will seriously affect the tenant population of the zamindari areas in Visakhapatnam and Srikakulam districts. Thank you, Sir."

* **SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH**: "అధ్యక్షా, ఈ సర్చార్జి బిల్లు చూస్తే నిజంగా యిది సర్చార్జి బిల్లే. ప్రతిదానికికూడా ఎక్కువ surcharge

31st July 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

చేయడానికి ప్రభుత్వం తలపెట్టుతున్నది. మొట్టమొదట భూమిశిస్తు విధానం ఏమిటో ఆలోచించి ఆయితరువాత దాని **fundamentals** ఏమిటో, ఆ విధానము ఎట్లు అమలు జరుపవలెనో తెలిసికొనినగాని శిస్తును విధించగూడదు. కాంగ్రెసు మొట్టమొదట పెట్టుకున్న సిద్ధాంతాల ప్రకారం చిన్న చిన్న రైతులమీద ఎటువంటి శిస్తు వేయగూడదని అన్నది. కాని యీ బిల్లునుబట్టి చూస్తే, చిన్న రైతులకు అట్టి సౌకర్యం కల్గించే ఆలోచనే లేదు. గాన, యిది పూర్తిగా కాంగ్రెసు సిద్ధాంతాలకు వ్యతిరేకముగానున్నదని చెప్పకతప్పదు. కాంగ్రెసు తీర్మానాల ననుసరించి **gradation tax** తీసుకోవలసిందని అన్నారు. ఆ **gradation tax** ప్రకారం వేరు అంతస్థుల వారిగా శిస్తులు వేయకపోవడము అనర్థము. ఈ విషయములో విచారణచేయుటకు శ్రీ కుమరప్ప కమిటీని వేశారు. ఈ రిపోర్టులో కొంతలోకొంత బీదరైతులకు, సహకారంగా సూచనలు చేయబడినవి. దానిని యిటీవల పరిశీలించగా ఆ కనీస సంస్కరణలు కూడా ప్రభుత్వానికి నచ్చలేదు. అది అంతయు అధర్మముగావున్నదని సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీని వేసి ఒక రిపోర్టును తయారుచేయాలన్నారు. ఆ సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం రిపోర్టులో యీ **gradation tax** విధానం పూర్తిగా తోసివేయబడింది. కుమరప్ప చేసిన కొద్దిపాటి అభివృద్ధికూడా తోసివేశారు. 150 రూపాయలు శిస్తు చెల్లించే వారిపై సర్‌చార్జి విధించవలెనన్నారు. మన దేశంలో వ్యవసాయంచేసుకొనేటటువంటి రైతులు చాలా మంది జాయింటు పట్టాదార్లుగా వుంటున్నారు. యీ సర్చార్జి యీ జాయింటు పట్టాదార్లకందరికి కలిపి వేశారు. అసలు యీ సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ రిపోర్టులో **defects** చాలావున్నవి. అవి అన్నియు యిప్పుడు వివరించుటకు సమయంచాలదు. వ్యవసాయాభివృద్ధికి ప్రభుత్వానికి డబ్బుకావలంటున్నారు. అందుకనే యీ సర్చార్జి వేస్తామంటున్నారు. అయితే ఎవరిమీద వేయాలి, ఎవరిమీద వేయగూడదనే విచక్షణ మాత్రం ప్రభుత్వము ఆలోచించవలసియుంటుంది. ప్రభుత్వానికి దేశం స్వయం సమృద్ధి చేయాలని ఉద్దేశం వున్నందువల్లనే యీ బిల్లును తెచ్చాం అంటున్నారు. వ్యవసాయాభివృద్ధి పన్ను వేస్తే సరిపోతుంది అపుడు చిన్న రైతాంగాన్ని వదలివేయబడుతుంది. కొన్ని తాలూకాలలో పేద రైతాంగం చాలా వున్నది. యిటువంటి పేద రైతాంగానికిన్ని మధ్య తరగతి రైతులను వదలివేస్తే, పెద్దపెద్ద భూస్వాములమీద ఈ సర్చార్జీల బదులు ఆదాయపు పన్ను వేసివుంటే చాలా బాగుండేది. అది అటులుండగా యీ సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ రిపోర్టు చెప్పినదికూడా మీరాచరించడంలేదు. చిన్నరైతాంగాన్నికూడా వదలకుండా అందరికి సరిసమానంగా ఈ బిల్లు వర్తించుచున్నది. అందువల్ల ఈ సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ రిపోర్టు చేసిన సూచనలకన్న అన్యాయంగా ఈ సర్చార్జి బిల్లు పేద రైతాంగముకు మధ్యతరగతి రైతులకు చాలా అన్యాయంచేస్తున్నది. సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ రూ 150 లకు పైగా శిస్తు చెల్లించేవారికి అన్వయింపచేయవలెనన్నది. సుబ్రహ్మణ్య కమిటీ రిపోర్టులో 50 రూపాయలు శిస్తు చెల్లించేవారికి వేయవలెనని చెప్పలేదు. 150 రూపాయలు చెల్లించేవారికే వేయవలెనన్నది. ఇపుడు మీరు చిన్న రైతుమీదకూడా వేస్తున్నారు. యీ శిస్తు చెల్లించేవారు ఎక్కువ బీదవారేగాని, కుటుంబపోషణకే చాలకుండా అవస్థలు పడేటటువంటివారు. యిట్టి పేదవారి మీదగూడా వేస్తే, పేద రైతులకు మరింత తలమీద భారము వేసి యింకా వాళ్లను కృంగదొక్కే విధానమని చెప్పవలసి వుంటుంది. 1950-51 వ సంవత్సరములో రూ 50 ల నుండి నూరు రూపాయలవరకు శిస్తు చెల్లించే వారు మన రాష్ట్రములో షుమారు 77,950 మంది వున్నారు. ఇక జాయింటు పట్టాలున్నవారి సంగతి చూడండి. ల్యాండ్ రెవిన్యూ వార్షిక నివేదికప్రకారం జాయింటు పట్టాదారులలో సగటున య 4.30 సెంట్లు భూమివున్న రైతుకుకూడా యీ చార్జి తగులుచున్నది. నూరు రూపాయల నుండి రెండువందల యాభై రూపాయలవరకూ చెల్లించేవాళ్లలో సింగిల్ పట్టాదారులు

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [31st July 1952

31,9 ర మందివున్నారు. ఇక జాయింటు పట్టాదారులు 56,543 మంది వున్నారు. అంటే సగటున 10 ఎకరాలుగల జాయింటు పట్టాదారుకూడ 50 ఎకరాల సింగిల్ పట్టాదారుకు సమానంగా సర్‌చార్జి చెల్లించవలసి వస్తుంది. ముఖ్యంగా మెట్ట తాలూకాలలో ఒక రైతుకు ఎంత ఆదాయము వస్తున్నదో పరిశీలించగోర్తాను. ఆ తాలూకాలలో శిస్తుకూడా ఎకరమునకు రూ 2-8-0, 3-0-0 లు మాత్రం వున్నది. అందువల్ల యీ మూడు రూపాయల శిస్తు చెల్లించేవారిమీద వేసే బదులు అధికాదాయంగల వారిమీద వ్యవసాయదాయపు పన్ను వేస్తే సరిపోదా? అంతేగాకుండా పల్లపు ప్రాంతాలలో consolidation శిస్తు అని వేశారు. consolidation శిస్తు అంటే తరం శిస్తు నీటి తీరువ ఈ రెంటిని కలిపిన శిస్తు అన్నారు. యీ consolidation శిస్తు ఎనిమిది రూపాయలనుంచి పది పదిహేనురూపాయలవరకూ వేస్తున్నారు. అంటే ఒక ఎకరము మొదలు 5 ఎకరాలున్న రైతుకు యిస్తామన్న రక్షణ లభించలేదు. చిన్న రైతుగూడ యీ పన్ను కట్టవలెనన్న మాటేగదా? సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం రిపోర్టు ప్రకారం 150 రూపాయలలోపు శిస్తుకట్టే రైతును మినహాయించనూ లేదు. కాంగ్రెస్ సిద్ధాంతం ప్రకారం ధనిక రైతుపై అదనంగా శిస్తు వేసే పద్ధతి అవలంభించలేదు. చిన్న రైతుకు భూమిశిస్తు లేకుండా మినహాయింపు కలిగించనూ లేదు. ఇక మధ్య తరగతి రైతుపై భారంవేయుటయే ఆశయంగా 50 రూపాయల శిస్తు చెల్లించేవారిపైనుంచి పన్ను ప్రారంభింపబడింది. యీ surcharge వగైరా పన్నులు యీ పేద రైతులమీద వేసేటట్లు అయితే, ఈ బిల్లు పూర్తిగా ప్రతిఘటించబడుతుంది. యీ సర్చార్జిని ఉపసంహరించి వ్యవసాయపు ఆదాయపు పన్నును విధించినట్లయితే బీద, చిన్న రైతు పన్ను భారం నుండి బయటపడడం, మధ్య రైతుపై భారంపడకుండావుండడం. పెద్ద రైతుపై అధిక పన్ను పడి ప్రభుత్వానికి ఆదాయం రావడం జరుగుతుంది. బీదరైతుమీద వేస్తే, యీ పన్నులే కట్టగలడా, వ్యవసాయ ఖర్చులు భరించి కుటుంబ పోషణచేసుకోగలడా అనేది ప్రభుత్వం ఆలోచించవలసి వుంటుంది. అందుచే వ్యవసాయపు ఆదాయపు పన్ను వేయుటకు పూనుకుంటూ ఈ సర్చార్జీ బిల్లును ఉపసంహరించుకోవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. ఈ కారణంతో నేడు యీ surcharge bill ను పూర్తిగా ప్రతిఘటించుచున్నాను."

* SRI N. GOPALA MENON:—" Sir, there is one aspect of this legislation which I want to impress on the hon. Members of this House and also on the Members of the Select Committee. This legislation is really in the nature of an agricultural income-tax. It is levied on the person who gets a large income. The basis is that if a person gets a large income, he ought to pay more tax. In Malabar, to which alone I am confining my remarks, the position is not the same as in other districts. In Malabar there are very many things which are quite different from the rest of the State. Politicians have brought in any number of land legislation in Malabar. They have not given to the land legislation that much of attention that it requires. They think that land tenures in Malabar are just the same as land tenures in other parts of the State. At any rate they want that land tenures in Malabar should be brought into line with the tenures that are prevalent in other parts of the State. In their craze for uniformity, they have been doing many things which have upset the economic situation in Malabar. These changes in land legislation have brought about a great deal of discontent in Malabar. I am sorry that the Government from 1836 have not properly attended to the conditions in

31st July 1952] [Sri N. Gopala Menon]

Malabar. There has been agrarian discontent from 1836 right up to 1921, when there came the Moplah rebellion. They attributed the rebellion to other causes. But it was the result of, and in essence due to the agrarian discontent in the district. Unfortunately, the people who were in charge of the district then had not been able to understand it properly.

"Now Sir, the position in respect of some families in Malabar is this: They pay a large amount of tax or, to be more exact, a large sum of money is paid as tax in the name of some of the janmis of Malabar. Their actual income will only be a fraction of the tax that they pay. Now, this Bill seeks to levy a surcharge on the tax that they are paying. Therefore, they will have to pay much more than the income that they get. This may look rather strange. But I shall just in a moment explain to you how it happens in Malabar in the case of certain families. There are certain tarwads in Malabar. The lands belonging to these tarwads are spread out among numerous tenants. The tenants are in actual possession and occupation of the lands. But they give annually a certain amount as michavaram which is a very small sum compared to the income that the tenants derive from the lands. But the tax is paid in the name of the janmi. Now, this legislation seeks to double the tax. That is to say, the janmi in his personal capacity will have to pay double the tax that he is now paying or that the tenants are now paying on his behalf. This being a surcharge, it is clear that the tenants will repudiate any liability to pay it. This is because it is not a tax on land but a tax on the pattadar. Therefore, we will have the strange phenomenon that the janmis in Malabar will be made to pay as tax more than what they actually get from the land and the real tenants who are cultivating the lands will be going scot-free. The object of this legislation is entirely otherwise. For want of time, I do not want to elaborate this. But I want to mention this to the hon. Members of this House and particularly to the Members of the Select Committee so that they may avoid trouble in Malabar. If the conditions in Malabar are not properly understood, there will be trouble in Malabar. Already we are experiencing a great deal of difficulty in Malabar on account of the fact that the hon. Members of this House who do not belong to our district do not pay adequate attention to any legislation pertaining to our district."

5-10 p.m.

SRI K. R. NALLASIVAM:—"கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, நிலவரி மீது சர்சார்ஜ் விதிப்பதற்காக அரசாங்கம் தற்போது கொண்டுவந்திருக்கும் இந்த மசோதாவினால் சாதாரண விவசாயிகள் தான் அதிகமாக பாதிக்கப் படுகின்றார்கள். பெருவாரியாக இந்த மாகாணத்திலே யார் நிலத்தில் பாடு படுகின்றார்களோ அவர்களைத்தான், இன்றுள்ள உருவத்தில் இந்த சர்சார்ஜ் முறையானது மிகவும் பாதிக்கிறது ரூ. 50-க்கு மேல் கிஸ்தி செலுத்தினால், அவர்கள் சர்சார்ஜ் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று சர்க்கார் முடிவு செய்திருக் கின்றார்கள். இந்த மாகாணத்தில் விவசாயிகளின் நிலைமையைப்பற்றி நான் ஏற்கெனவே பட்ஜெட் பொது விவாதத்தின் போது பேசியிருக்கின்றேன். குறைந்த அளவு வரி செலுத்திக்கொண்டிருக்கக்கூடிய விவசாயிகளை மேலும் வரி செலுத்தும்படிச் சொல்வது நியாயமாக இருக்காது. அவர்களுடைய வரிப்பளுவைக் குறைக்கவேண்டும். ஏனென்றால், அவர்கள் தான் இந்த வரியினால் அதிகம் பாதிக்கப்படுகின்றார்கள்.

[Sri K. R. Nallasivam] [31st July 1952

" ரூ. 100-க்குக் குறைவாக வரி செலுத்தக்கூடிய விவசாயிகளின் பளு குறைக்கப்படவேண்டுமென்று, மாகாணம் பூராவும், சகல தரப்பிலிருக்கக் கூடியவர்களும் ஓயாமல் கிளர்ச்சி செய்துகொண்டிருக்கின்றார்கள். அப்படியிருக்கும்பொழுது ரூ. 100-க்கு கீழ் கிஸ்தி செலுத்தக்கூடியவர்களும் இன்று மீண்டும் வரி அதிகப்படியாகக் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொல்வது மக்களுடைய எதிர்ப்புக்கு நிரந்தரமான ஆதரவு கொடுக்கு மென்பதை சர்க்கார் ஞாபகத்தில் வைத்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டும்.

" என்னுடைய ஜில்லாவை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால், பெருவாரியான இடங்கள் காய்ந்துபோய் கிடக்கின்றன. அந்தப் பிரதேசங்கள் பஞ்சத்தினால் பாதிக்கப்பட்டு இருக்கின்றன. 100 ஏக்கர் வைத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கக்கூடிய விவசாயிகள்கூட சர்க்காரின் கிஸ்தியைச் செலுத்துவதற்கும் வகையில்லாமல், மனைவியின் கழுத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய சரட்டைக்கூட விற்கக்கூடிய நிர்பந்தமான நிலையில் அவதிப்படுகின்றார்கள். ஆகையால், இந்த மாதிரி குறைந்த அளவு வரி செலுத்தக்கூடிய விவசாயிகள் மீண்டும் வரி செலுத்தவேண்டுமென்று கட்டாயப்படுத்தும் இந்த மசோதாவை நாங்கள் பரிபூரணமாக எதிர்க்கின்றோம்.

" இந்த வரியானது எப்படி இருக்கவேண்டுமென்று நான் நினைக்கிறேன் என்றால், ரூ. 100-க்கு மேல் ரூ. 200 வரையில் கிஸ்தி செலுத்துபவர்கள் ஒரு ரூபாய் வீதமும், ரூ. 200-லிருந்து 300 வரையில் கிஸ்தி செலுத்துபவர்கள் இரண்டு ரூபாய் வீதமும், இதேமாதிரி உயர்த்திக்கொண்டே போய், ரூ. 500-க்கு மேல் கிஸ்தி செலுத்துபவர்கள் குறைந்த பக்ஷம் 5 அல்லது 6 மடங்கு அதிகப்படியான வரி கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என்றிருக்கவேண்டும்.

" அதுமட்டுமல்ல. சர்க்கார் இதற்கு ஒரு சால்ஜாப்பு சொல்லுகிறார்கள். ரூ 50-க்கு மேல் ரூ. 100-வரை கிஸ்தி செலுத்துபவர்கள் தான் இந்த மாகாணத்தில் அதிகமாக இருக்கின்றார்கள். ஆகவே அவர்கள் மீது வரி போடவேண்டுமென்று சொல்கிறார்கள். ஆனால், அதற்கு இதுதான் சரியான வழியென்று நான சொல்லுகின்றேன். அதாவது, ரூ. 100-லிருந்து ரூ. 500 வரை கிஸ்தி செலுத்துபவர்களிடமிருந்து படிப்படியாய், 1 முதல் 5 அல்லது 6 மடங்கு வரியை உயர்த்திக்கொண்டே போனால், நிச்சயமாக இதைச் சரிப்படுத்திவிடலாமென்று நினைக்கின்றேன். ஆகவே, அந்த முறையிலே இதை மாற்றியமைக்க வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன்.

" கோயமுத்தூர் ஜில்லாவில் பெருவாரியான நிலங்கள் புஞ்சை நிலங்களாக இருக்கின்றன. புஞ்சை நிலங்களுக்கு இன்று பல இடங்களில் வரி வஜா அளிக்கப்படவில்லை. எங்கள் ஜில்லாவானது பஞ்சப் பிரதேசமாக இருப்பதால், விவசாயிகள் மிகவும் கஷ்டப்படுகிறார்கள். அதேமாதிரி நஞ்சைப் பிரதேசங்களுக்கும் தண்ணீர் பாயாமல் பொட்டல் நிலங்களாக கிடக்கின்றன. அந்த இடங்களிலும் வரி செலுத்தக்கூடிய நிலையில் இல்லாமல் இருக்கிறார்கள்.

" இதற்கெல்லாம் பரிகாரம் சமுதாய மாற்றம் ஏற்படவேண்டும். நிலச் சீர்திருத்தம் ஏற்படவேண்டும். நிலவுரிமையை மாற்றுவதன்மூலம் இன்றிருக்கக்கூடிய விவசாயிகளுடைய கஷ்ட நஷ்டங்களைத் தீர்க்க முடியுமென்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டு, இந்த மசோதாவை எதிர்க்கின்றேன்."

Sri E. L. Raghava Mudaliar :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, Now I am reminded of the answer that the Hon. the Revenue Minister gave in reply to the debate on the Famine Demand. He said that every Member of this House including the Raja of Chettinad was an Oliver Twist. To-day by a curious irony of fate the hon. Member the Raja of Chettinad has become an Oliver Twist. He was asking for more and more facilities. But there are justifications for us to become Oliver Twists because we pay and ask a return for it. What is the return that the Hon. the Revenue Minister is promising for this additional demand he makes this year? What is the additional benefit promised to the poor ryot who has to pay this money? The small peasant proprietor whom

31st July 1952] [Sri E. L. Raghava Mudaliar]

this Government are always saying that they are protecting and for whom this Government exist, is not looked after well. Additional tax will be an additional burden on the already overburdened small proprietor. Even according to the Land Revenue Reforms Committee Report to which the Hon. the Finance Minister was a party, eight times the kist payable is assumed to be the net income derived by the peasant. Now, the maximum assessment this Bill seeks to exempt from taxation is Rs. 50. That means, a man who has got an average income of Rs. 400 a year is exempt and anybody who is getting more than that is liable to pay the surcharge. This is making an invidious distinction between the agricultural sector and the professional, industrial and commercial sectors. With regard to income-tax, there is an exemption up to an annual income of Rs. 3,500 to a joint family. But here it is proposed to exempt only up to Rs. 400. Why this invidious distinction and discrimination? The Government always say that the peasant is entitled to some favourable treatment from them. Explaining the objects of the Bill, the Hon. Minister said that this was just to bring about the long-needed land revenue reform that the assessment should be made equitable and just. But we do not want this sort of justice and equity. We would rather welcome the agricultural income-tax which was mooted here some two or three years back. It gave exemption up to an income of Rs. 5,000 a year. That means only persons who are paying a land tax of Rs. 600 and above will be liable to agricultural income-tax. The Hon. Minister himself says in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that this surcharge is only in the place of the agricultural income-tax. Then, why not the Government levy directly the agricultural income-tax and exempt the small proprietors from payment of that tax? I ask how many of the people who are paying a land tax of Rs. 200 and Rs. 300 are able to spare anything to pay this additional surcharge? From my personal knowledge I may say that many of these small proprietors are not able to replace even the cattle which have died.

" They are not able to repair the irrigation wells and they are not able to replace the machinery employed in irrigation. At this stage, it will be very inadvisale to levy any new taxes on the small proprietors in addition to the land tax and other taxes. 5-20 p.m.

" You have been proclaiming before the formation of the Ministry that there will not be any new taxes. In spite of that, you have come forward with proposals for levying three or four new taxes. I feel that it will be very difficult for small agriculturists to pay any additional taxes, unless the Government can promise immediate return in the shape of additional amenities to the agriculturists."

* SRI C. RAJAM RAMASAMI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think I will be ploughing a lonely furrow when I say that this taxation measure is very well conceived. The idea of levying a surcharge on land revenue is the best form of tax that can be levied on agricultural income. I personally feel that the business and the mercantile community are being very heavily taxed and that they are

bearing practically all the burden of taxation in this country. If we want an equitable system of taxation, then agriculturists must also pay their share. A large sum of money is in the hands of agriculturists and quite a good portion of it is outside the scope of income-tax. How are we to collect money from them if the Government are to run the administration? Now, a large volume of money is kept in circulation without being assessed to any form of tax. In their weekly publication of notes in circulation, the Reserve Bank of India, Issue Department, have been showing that about Rs. 1,100 crores of notes are still in circulation. How is it that such a large sum of money is still in circulation? All this money is in the hands of the rich mirasdars and others in the rural parts. If we want our Rs. 5 crores loan to be successful, then we must tap rural credit and savings. We have big mirasdars getting an income of about Rs. 5 to Rs. 10 lakhs a year and all this money is escaping taxation. Instead of having a direct income-tax, the present measure of levying some sort of a surcharge resulting in an easy payment of tax to the Government is the best under the present circumstances. Levying of income-tax is a very serious and tedious process. I know from practical experience how difficult it is to submit returns to the income-tax officers and getting our accounts through. It is a hell of a job. Therefore, I think Sir, the Government have done very well and very wisely in not having a direct income-tax, but have decided on a graded surcharge. By introducing income-tax, the Government will unnecessarily be giving trouble to the poor farmer and ask him to maintain account books and so on. It will really be very difficult for him to submit accounts to the officers and get his assessment completed. Therefore, this idea of a surcharge on agricultural income is perhaps the best and a well-conceived measure. I strongly feel that this should be supported by all sections of this House. I know I will be criticized from all sides for making this suggestion, as practically the majority of the Members represent some landed interest or other and so, they may not like my suggestion. But, I know for certain that a large section of this community is practically keeping the money idle. They have a lot of money in their hands. The richer mirasdars, who have large sums of money with them, do not come to the rescue of Government when Government need their assistance. It is they that starve the financial markets and the credit in this country. There should be no objection to raising the exemption limit from Rs. 50 to Rs. 250. It does not matter. The rich land-owners who have a lot of money idle must be taxed. This is very necessary in the larger interests of the country. I therefore support this well-conceived measure."

Sri P. KUNHIRAMA KIDAV:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, മലബാറിലെ ഭൂവുടമസ്ഥതയുടെ പ്രത്യേകത ഹേതുവായി മലബാറിന്റെ പ്രതിനിധി എന്ന നിലയിൽ ഈ നിയമത്തെ എതിർക്കേണ്ടതു് എന്റെ കർത്തവ്യം മാത്രമാണു്. മലബാറിലെ ജന്മി-കുടിയായ്മ ബന്ധം പരിശോധിച്ചുനോക്കുന്നപക്ഷം ഒരു കുടിയാൻ ജന്മിക്കു എഴുതികൊടുക്കുന്ന കച്ചീട്ടിൽ സർക്കാരിലേക്കു വർദ്ധിച്ച നികുതി കൊടുക്കേണ്ടതായാൽ അതു മുഴുവനും കുടിയാൻ കൊടുക്കണം എന്നു പ്രത്യേകം വ്യവസ്ഥ ചെയ്യുന്നുണ്ടു്. ഈ വ്യവസ്ഥയുടെ അടിസ്ഥാനത്തിൽ ഗവർമ്മേണ്ടു് ജന്മിയുടെ കയ്യിൽനിന്നു നികുതി വസൂൽ ചെയ്യണം എന്നു ഉദ്ദേശമുണ്ടെങ്കിലും യഥാർത്ഥത്തിൽ മലബാറിലെ കൃഷിക്കാരുടെ ചുമലിൽ ആണു് ഈ

31st July 1952] [Sri P. Kunhirama Kidav]

നികുതിഭാരം ചെന്നു ചാടാൻ പോകുന്നത്. അതുതന്നെയല്ല 50 ഉറുപ്പികയിൽ കവിഞ്ഞ വരവ് ഉള്ളവരിൽ നിന്നു മാത്രമെ നികുതി വസൂൽ ചെയ്യുകയുള്ളൂ എന്ന നിയമമുണ്ടെങ്കിലും ജന്മി കൊടുക്കുന്ന നികുതി കൃഷിക്കാരിൽ നിന്നു കച്ചീട്ടിൽ നിർദ്ദേശിച്ച ശതമാനക്കണക്കനുസരിച്ചു വസൂലാകാവുന്നതാണ്. ഇന്നു ഗവർമ്മെണ്ട് നിശ്ചയിക്കുന്ന rateൽ കൂടുതലായി ഇപ്പോൾതന്നെ നികുതികൊണ്ടും പാട്ടഭാരംകൊണ്ടും കഷ്ടപ്പെടുന്ന മലബാറിലെ കൃഷിക്കാർ കൊടുക്കേണ്ടിവരും. അതാണ് ഈ നികുതിയുടെ സ്വഭാവം. ഈ നികുതി ജന്മിതന്നെ കൊടുക്കണം എന്നു ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടെങ്കിലും, വമ്പിച്ച അനീതികളുടെ അന്യോന്യവിരുദ്ധതകളും അടങ്ങിയ ഒരു നിയമമാണ് ഇതെന്നു പറയേണ്ടിയിരിക്കുന്നു. ഒരായിരം ഉറുപ്പിക നികുതി കൊടുക്കേണ്ടുന്ന കൂട്ടുകുടുംബത്തിൻെറ സ്ഥിതി ഇന്നു ചിന്തിച്ചാൽ ഇരുപതു പേരുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ അമ്പതു ഉറുപ്പികതോതിൽ ഈ കൂട്ടുകുടുംബത്തിലെ ഓരോ അംഗവും ഗവർമ്മെണ്ടിലേക്കു കൊടുക്കേണ്ടിവരുന്നുണ്ട്. യഥാർത്ഥത്തിൽ ഇതു വമ്പിച്ച അനീതിയാണ്. അതുകൊണ്ട് കൂട്ടുകുടുംബത്തിൻെറ ഇന്നത്തെ വ്യവസ്ഥകൊണ്ടു അവരെ ഈ നികുതിയുടെ പരിധിയിൽനിന്നു ഒഴിവാക്കണം എന്നാണ് എൻെറ ബലമായ അഭിപ്രായം. നൂറ് ഉറുപ്പിക നികുതി കൊടുക്കേണ്ടുന്ന സ്വത്ത് കൈവശമുള്ള കൈവശക്കാരനു ആ സ്വത്തിൽനിന്നു കിട്ടുന്ന ആദായവും നൂറ് ഉറുപ്പിക നികുതിക്കുള്ള സ്വത്ത് ചാർത്തികൊടുത്ത ആളുടെ വരവും തമ്മിൽ വലിയ അന്തരമുണ്ടെങ്കിലും നികുതിയെ സംബന്ധിച്ചേടത്തോളം ആദായം കുറഞ്ഞ ആളാണ് കൂടുതൽ നികുതി കൊടുക്കേണ്ടിവരുന്നത്. അതുകൊണ്ട് മലബാറിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചേടത്തോളം ഈ നിയമം വലിയ അനീതിയും വിഷമതകളും സൃഷ്ടിക്കുന്നതാണ്. അതുകൊണ്ട് ഈ നിയമത്തെ ഞാൻ ശക്തിയായി എതിർക്കുന്നു.''

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am taking this opportunity not to make any speech on this subject, because this Bill is going to be referred to a Select Committee."

MR. SPEAKER :—" In that case, I will advise the hon. Member to sit down. (Laughter.)

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" Any way, I wish to make a few submissions. As my name has been proposed for the Select Committee, I wish to submit that we have made our Party's stand very clear on the floor of the House on many occasions. We have been repeatedly telling that the kisans are against the present land revenue system. So, without committing our Party to anything, I am going into the Select Committee. Some hon. Members were saying that the exemption limit can be raised to Rs. 150, Rs. 200 or even Rs. 250, and that the rich peasants must be taxed. On principle, we are not against taxing the rich peasants. Whatever it is, we feel that the surcharge on land revenue is detrimental to the very principle of land revenue system. If the Government are really sincere in getting more revenue for the State from the rich peasants, they should bring out a new proposal. Under these circumstances, I request the Government to withdraw the present Bill and substitute in its place a new one which will give real benefit to the peasants.'''

• SRI R. KRISHNAN :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, ഗവർമ്മെണ്ട് ഭാഗത്തിൽനിന്നു പറഞ്ഞമാതിരി ഇതു ജന്മികളെമാത്രം ബാധിക്കുന്ന ഒരു നികുതിയല്ല. മലബാറിനെ 5-30 p.m.
സംബന്ധിച്ചേടത്തോളം ഇതിന്നുമുമ്പു സംസാരിച്ച എൻെറ സ്നേഹിതന്മാർ പറഞ്ഞുകഴിഞ്ഞു മലബാറിന്നു ഒരു പ്രത്യേകതയുണ്ടെന്നു. മലബാർ കുടിയായ്മ നിയമപ്രകാരം മലബാറിൽ ജന്മി കൊടുക്കേണ്ടുന്ന നികുതിയിൽ പകുതി ഭാഗവും കുടിയാൻ കൊടുക്കേണ്ടിവരുമ്പോൾ, ഈ സർച്ചാർജ്ജിൻെറ ഭാരം മുഴുവനും കുടിയാൻെറ തലയിലാണു വന്നു വീഴുന്നത്, ജന്മിയുടെ മേലല്ല. ജന്മിക്കു ആദ്യം കൊടുത്തിരുന്ന നികുതിയിലും ചുരുങ്ങികൊടുത്താൽ മതിയാകുന്നതാണ്. ഈ നികുതി കൃഷിക്കാരെ ബാധിക്കാതിരിക്കണമെങ്കിൽ മലബാർ കുടിയായ്മ ബിൽതന്നെ മാററപ്പെടേണ്ടതായിട്ടുണ്ട്. സ്വതവേതന്നെ

[Sri R. Krishnan] [31st July 1952

ആ ബില്ലുകൊണ്ടു പാപ്പരായി തീർന്ന കുടിയാന്മാർ ജന്മിമാരുടെ പാട്ടബാക്കിക്കും മററും ഒഴിയാൻ കേസ്സുകൊടുത്തു ബുദ്ധിമുട്ടിക്കുന്ന ശ്രമങ്ങളേയും സഹിച്ചിരിക്കെ ഈ നികുതികൂടി കൊടുക്കുവാൻ പറയുകയാണെങ്കിൽ മലബാറിലെ കൃഷിക്കാർ പൊളിയും എന്നുമാത്രമല്ല ഇതിന്റെ തിക്തഫലം അവിടത്തെ കൃഷിയെക്കൂടി ബാധിക്കാതെ ഇരിക്കുകയില്ല. ക്ഷാമം കൂടുതൽ വർദ്ധിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യും. മലബാർ കുടിയായ്മ നിയമത്തിൽ ഇന്നത്തെ നിലയിൽനിന്നു കാര്യമായി മാററം വരുത്തേണ്ടതാണെന്നു മലബാറിലെ കൃഷിക്കാരുടെ ആവശ്യമാണ്. മലബാറിലെ എല്ലാ കക്ഷികളിലും പെടുന്നവരും ഒരു കക്ഷിയിലും പെടാത്തവരുമായ എല്ലാ കൃഷിക്കാരും ആ നിയമത്തെ എതിർത്തിട്ടുണ്ട്. മലബാറിലെ എം.എൽ.എ. മാരായ ഞങ്ങളും ആ നിമയത്തെ എതിർത്തിട്ടുണ്ടു. ഈ എതിർപ്പിനെ ഗവർമ്മേണ്ടു വകവെച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടോ, ഗവർമ്മേണ്ടു എന്താണ് ആ നിയമത്തെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു ചെയ്യാൻ പോകുന്നതു എന്നു ഇനിയും അറിവായിട്ടില്ല. ഇങ്ങിനെ ഇരിക്കെ ഈ നികുതിഭാരംകൂടി അവരുടെ തലയിൽ വെച്ചുകൊടുക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ അതു മലബാറിനോടു ചെയ്യുന്ന ഒരു വമ്പിച്ച അപരാധമായിരിക്കും. ഇതു ഭൂമി ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാരെ മാത്രം ബാധിക്കുന്ന ഒരു സംഗതിയല്ല. മലബാറിലെ എല്ലാ ജനങ്ങളേയും ബാധിക്കുന്ന ഈ പുതിയ നികുതികളെ എല്ലാം എതിർക്കാനാണു ഞങ്ങൾ തീർമാനിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതു്. Select Committee മെമ്പർമാരോടു ഒന്നു രണ്ടു കാര്യങ്ങൾ പറയുവാനുണ്ട്. എന്തെന്നാൽ മദിരാശിയിൽ മന്ത്രിസഭ ആപ്പീസ്സിൽ ഇരുന്നുകൊണ്ടു് ഈ കാര്യത്തിൽ ഒരു തീരുമാനം വരുത്താതെ നികുതിദായകന്മാരുടെ ഇടയിലാണു നിങ്ങൾ പോകേണ്ടതു്. കൃഷിക്കാരുടേയും ഭൂ ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാരുടേയും ഇടയിൽപോയി നിങ്ങൾ വരുന്നതിനെപ്പററിയുള്ള മുന്നറിവു് അവർക്കു കൊടുത്തു അവരുമായി ആലോചിച്ചു ഈ നികുതി കൃഷിക്കാരെ എത്രകണ്ടു ബാധിക്കും, ജന്മിമാരെ എത്രകണ്ടു ബാധിക്കും, ഏതെല്ലാം നിലയിൽ ബാധിക്കും എന്നെല്ലാം നാട്ടുകാരെ സമീപിച്ചു കാര്യങ്ങൾ നേരിട്ടു മനസ്സിലാക്കേണ്ടതാണ്. ഇതിനുശേഷമെ നിയമമാക്കാൻ പാടുള്ളു. ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട Select Committee അംഗങ്ങൾ ഈ കാര്യം വെറുതെ നിയമമാക്കിയാൽ പോരാ, കൃഷിക്കാരുടെ ഇടയിൽചെന്നു അന്വേഷിച്ചു അവർക്കു ദോഷം വരാത്തവിധത്തിൽ ഒന്നുകിൽ ബില്ലിനെ തള്ളിക്കളയുവാൻ സാധിക്കണം അല്ലെങ്കിൽ കാര്യമായ ഭേദഗതികൾവരുത്തി കൃഷിക്കാരെ സഹായിക്കണം എന്നാണു എനിക്കു അഭ്യർത്ഥിക്കാനുള്ളതു്. പ്രധാനമന്ത്രി പറഞ്ഞു സ്ത്രീകൾ അവരുടെ ആഭരണങ്ങൾ വിററിട്ടെങ്കിലും നികുതി കൊടുക്കണമെന്നു. തീർച്ചയായും കൊടുക്കാം. പക്ഷെ ഇതു കൃഷിക്കാരുടെ കുട്ടികൾക്കു വിദ്യാഭ്യാസം കൊടുക്കാനാണോ കൃഷിക്കാരുടെ കുട്ടികൾക്കു ഉദ്യോഗം കൊടുക്കാനാണോ തൊഴിലില്ലായ്മക്കു ഒരു പരിഹാരം കാണാനാണോ ക്ഷാമം പരിഹരിക്കാനാണോ. അല്ല പോലീസിനെ തീ-റിപോററുവാനും, ഉയർന്ന ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാർക്കു വലിയ ശമ്പളം കൊടുക്കുവാനും, ജമീന്താർമാർക്കു പ്രതിഫലം കൊടുക്കുവാനും ജനദ്രോഹം ചെയ്യുവാനും വേണ്ടിയാണ് ഈ നികുതി എങ്കിൽ അതു കഷ്ടമാണു്. സാധാരണ തന്നെ കൊടുക്കുന്ന വില്പന നികുതി, ഇപ്പോൾ കെട്ടാൻ പോകുന്ന Betterment tax, നിലവിലുള്ള Land tax ഇതെല്ലാം കൊടുത്തു കഷ്ടപ്പെട്ടു, മുടിയുന്ന പാപ്പരായിട്ടുള്ള കൃഷിക്കാർക്കു നിലവിലുള്ള വർദ്ധിച്ച ഭാരം ഒന്നുകൂടി അധികമാക്കാൻ പോകുന്ന ഈ നികുതിയെ അനുകൂലിക്കുവാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല. അതുകൊണ്ടു ഈ നികുതിയെ ഞാൻ ശക്തിയായി എതിർക്കുന്നു.''

* SRI S. C. VIRUPAKSHAYYA :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Bill before the House. I do so because the richer classes do not bear the burden of taxation equally with the poor and the principle underlying the Bill is such that it provides for a graded scale of taxation. But I wish to suggest two or three modifications to the present Bill. The first and foremost is that the exemption limit should be raised. The Bill as it stands puts it at fifty rupees and it has got to be raised to one hundred or one hundred and fifty rupees as suggested by the Land Revenue Reforms Committee headed by Mr. M. V. Subramaniam. If the limit is kept at fifty rupees, then an ordinary person owning five or six acres of land will be brought within the purview of the measure. The cost of labour and production has gone up and a person paying an assessment of a little over fifty rupees finds it very hard to make

31st July 1952] [Sri S. C. Virupakshayya]

both ends meet. Therefore, this exemption limit, in fairness to the peasants, must be raised to one hundred or one hundred and fifty rupees.

" Secondly, Sir, the land revenue records as they stand now are far from satisfactory. The list of registered holders is not properly maintained. Very often changes in ownership take place and lands go from one hand to another. The changes must be registered then and there. I want that the Government should make suitable arrangements to make the records regarding these transactions up-to-date and then bring the present measure into force. Otherwise, the revenue officials will be asked to use their discretion and this will give a handle to them to manipulate things. Therefore, unless the records are brought up-to-date and the actual holders of land are registered as such, this measure should not be brought into force.

" Thirdly, Sir, this Bill bars recognition of fractional holding or partition for a period of three years. This period is too long and it may work hardship on *bona fide* partitions. As such, some arrangement should be made to recognize *bona fide* partitions. Then again, it does not make any difference between the individual and the Hindu undivided family. Under the present system of Hindu joint family, a family consits of a good number of persons and in other cases it is very small. Therefore, the differentiation in the size of the families must be recognized.

" With these modifications, I support the Bill and commend it to the Select Committee. I hope the Select Committee will give effect to the suggestions I have made."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill has aroused great criticism and I would say, greater criticism than the other Bills. However, as I have said about the other Bills, the Opposition without committing itself to the principle underlying it has agreed to a Select Committee going into this Bill also. It will be easy to differentiate between one item and another and also speak in favour of one item while condemning another item of the Bill. But I shall refrain from the temptation of doing so, as we have agreed to go into the Select Committee. I would, however, submit to the Hon. the Revenue Minister and the Government to take note of all the criticisms made in this House. I hope that the Government will keep an open mind in the matter and will not be prestige-ridden and, at the time when the Select Committee meets, they will try to do real justice in the interests of the common man, the poor man and the lower middle-class man.

" With these words, I support the Motion before the House."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank the hon. Members for the views they have expressed on this Bill starting with the criticism of Mr. Ramamurthi and ending with the strong support given by Mr. Ramaswami. I leave the hon. Leader of the Opposition alone as he is a class by himself. The hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi no doubt made an eloquent speech but I submit it would have 5-40 p.m.

been more appropriate if it had been made during the discussion of a major land reform measure and not on this particular piece of legislation. Then by a jugglery of figures, the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi doubled the income of ryots and made my mouth water when he said from Tanjore alone I could get 6 to 8 crores of rupees. I do not want to go into details of his speech as he is not here just now. Sir, the hon. Member Mr. Muthiah Chettiyar as usual suggested some good and practical ways of improving the Bill and I hope they will be considered by the Select Committee. Then the hon. Member Mr. Kandaswami referred to the contact being had with the mirasdars. I may tell him that I am also in constant touch with the tenants and the Harijans and the have-nots and my mind is very much exercised over them. Then, Sir, reference was made to Malabar and it was suggested that it should be treated as a special case. It is peculiar in many respects not only in the physical features, but in customs, system of land-tenure and all that. I am very glad that hon. Member Mr. Gopala Menon made a good case for the view-point expressed by him. I believe he is not in the Select Committee. It is a pity. However I expect him to act as a good solicitor and put up his view-point before the Select Committee through the Malabar representatives. Then, it was said that I am asking like Oliver Twist but not giving anything. I submit I am asking only to give back. The only difference is I cannot ask for a certain amount and after getting it give it back straightway. I take the money into the collecting pot and distribute it. There is the artesian well coming up only at a particular place and not in all places though there is water underneath the surface of the land in all places. The water may come up in Tiruppattur of North Arcot district or Tiruppattur of Ramanathapuram district. It is left to our luck and the physical features of the land.

"Sir, I hope I have met the main points that were made during the discussion. I do not propose to tire the House by adding more of my remarks as the Bill is to be referred to the Select Committee. The various suggestions and proposals made by hon. Members will be gone into thoroughly. Further, as was anticipated by the Leader of the Opposition—I do not know how he anticipated me—I am having an open mind as regards the details of this Bill and everything could be thoroughly discussed in the Select Committee and I can assure the hon. Members that we will try to do what best we can."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The question is—

'That the Madras Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 6 of 1952), be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members and that leave of the House be granted under rule 81 for the Select Committee to consist of more than fifteen persons :—

The Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.

,, C. Subramaniam.

31st July 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

Sri K. Rajaram.
,, P. Venkataswami Reddi.
,, A. Venkatramaiah.
,, S. Venkatrama Ayyar.
,, S. Chinnakaruppa Thevar.
,, H. Satyanarayana Dora.
,, P. S. Krishnasamy Ayyangar.
,, B. Parameswaran.
,, L. Lakshmana Das.
Janab K. Uppi.
Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai.
,, G. Latchanna.
,, B. Bhakthavatsalu Naidu.
,, T. Viswanatham.
,, C. H. Kanaran.
,, C. Ramalingiah.
,, P. Ramamurthi.
,, S. S. Kolkebail.
,, M. Narayana Kurup.
,, S. Swayamprakasam.
,, G. C. Kondiah.
,, K. Aranganathan.
,, M. Jagannathan.' "

The motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I appoint the Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker as the Chairman of the Committee."

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :—" Sir, in view of the fact that this is an important matter affecting the people of Malabar I would request the House to direct the Select Committee to record evidence from the people of Malabar."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" The Select Committee will do it if it is found necessary."

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :—" Sir, unless it is authorized how can it take evidence? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Select Committee knows its duty. We shall now take up the next Bill."

(6) THE BHAVANI RESERVOIR IRRIGATION CESS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952.[a]

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I beg to introduce the Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952 and move—

' *That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members and that leave of the House be granted under rule 81 for the Select Committee to consist of more than fifteen persons :—*

1. *The Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.*
2. *,, C. Subramaniam.*
3. *Sri K. Rajaram.*
4. *,, P. S. Rangasamy Naidu.*
5. *,, P. G. Karuthiruman.*
6. *,, B. K. Nallasamy.*
7. *,, M. R. Ramachandran.*
8. *,, G. Vagheesam Pillai.*
9. *,, P. M. Muniswamy Gounder.*
10. *,, S. Arumugam.*
11. *,, V. S. Sivaprakasam.*
12. *,, N. C. Ramasamy Kander.*
13. *,, S. Pakkirisami Pillai.*
14. *,, M. Muni Reddi.*
15. *,, K. S. Lakshmipathy Naicker.*
16. *,, K. T. Raju.*
17. *,, C. Kandaswami.*
18. *,, N. K. Palaniswami.*
19. *,, P. Ramamurthi.*
20. *,, A. Senapathi Goundar.*
21. *,, P. Kandasamy Gounder.*
22. *,, E. L. Raghava Mudaliar.*
23. *,, S. Kandaswami Gounder.*
24. *,, M. Dharmalingam.*
25. *,, Mookiah Thevar.*

" Sir, I do not propose to say anything in detail about this Bill because this is about a project that is about to be finished and every one knows why this levy is proposed. I simply move the motion."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The motion is—

' That the Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the

[a] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 28th June 1952

31st July 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

following Members and that leave of the House be granted under rule 81 for the Select Committee to consist of more than fifteen persons :—

1. The Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
2. ,, C. Subramaniam.
3. Sri K. Rajaram.
4. ,, P. S. Rangasamy Naidu.
5. ,, P. G. Karuthiruman.
6. ,, B. K. Nallasamy.
7. ,, M. R. Ramachandran.
8. ,, G. Vagheesam Pillai.
9. ,, P. M. Muniswamy Gounder.
10. ,, S. Arumugam.
11. ,, V. S. Sivaprakasam.
12. ,, N. C. Ramasamy Kander.
13. ,, S. Pakkirisami Pillai.
14. ,, M. Muni Reddi.
15. ,, K. S. Lakshmipathy Naicker.
16. ,, K. T. Raju.
17. ,, C. Kandaswami.
18. ,, N. K. Palaniswami.
19. ,, P. Ramamurthi.
20. ,, A. Senapathi Goundar.
21. ,, P. Kandasamy Gounder.
22. ,, E. L. Raghava Mudaliar.
23. ,, S. Kandaswami Gounder.
24. ,, M. Dharmalingam.
25. ,, Mookiah Thevar.

" The hon. Member Sri K. T. Raju who has given notice of an amendment to this motion is not here. I am going to put the motion to the vote of the House."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, we oppose this Bill also but as in the case of other Bills we have agreed to let this Bill be referred to the Select Committee."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Sir, as this Bill concerns the people of Coimbatore I thought Members representing that district would be put on the Select Committee. On the other hand I find some who may not have any interest in the project are put in the Committee to satisfy party interest, and Members interested in the project have been left out."

SRI K. RAJARAM :—" It is not so, Sir. Coimbatore is well represented."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Sir, I submit that Coimbatore might have been properly represented when compared to the representation given to other districts in the State. I believe that is what the hon. Member Sri Rajaram says. That I don't dispute. But what I say is, there are members coming from Coimbatore district who ought to have been chosen for the Committee because it is only they that can give proper and profitable service to the Committee. They have not been chosen. That is my submission."

5-50 p.m. * THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, the hon. Member has just now come into the House and he has not posted himself with what took place here. This list was prepared after consulting the Leaders of Parties."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

'That the Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following members and that leave of the House be granted under rule 81 for the Select Committee to consist of more than fifteen persons :—

1. The Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
2. ,, C. Subramaniam.
3. Sri K. Rajaram.
4. ,, P. S. Rangasamy Naidu.
5. ,, P. G. Karuthiruman.
6. ,, B. K. Nallasamy.
7. ,, M. R. Ramachandran.
8. ,, G. Vagheesam Pillai.
9. ,, P. M. Muniswamy Gounder.
10. ,, S. Arumugam.
11. ,, V. S. Sivaprakasam.
12. ,, N. C. Ramasamy Kander.
13. ,, S. Pakkirisami Pillai.
14. ,, M. Muni Reddi.
15. ,, K. S. Lakshmipathy Naicker.
16. ,, K. T. Raju.
17. ,, C. Kandaswami.
18. ,, N. K. Palaniswami.
19. ,, P. Ramamurthi.
20. ,, A. Senapathi Goundar.
21. ,, P. Kandasamy Gounder.
22. ,, E. L. Raghava Mudaliar.
23. ,, S. Kandaswami Gounder.
24. ,, M. Dharmalingam.
25. ,, Mookiah Thevar.

The motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I appoint the Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker to be the Chairman of the Committee."

(7) THE MADRAS ESTATES LAND (REDUCTION OF RENT) AMENDMENT BILL[a], 1952.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to introduce the Madras Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill, 1952, and move—

'That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.' "

MR. SPEAKER :—"I thought the Hon. Minister was moving a motion for referring the Bill to a Select Committee."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"Sir, as this is a small Bill, I thought the Opposition was not particular of referring it to a Select Committee."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"Sir, we are not only particular, but we have also given the list of names to be included in the Select Committee. I would suggest that the Hon. Minister himself may move a motion for referring the Bill to a Select Committee."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"Sir, I made a last attempt to convince the hon. Leader of the Opposition. If they want the Bill to be referred to a Select Committee, I have no objection.

"Sir, in supersession of my previous motion, I beg to introduce the Madras Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill, 1952, and move—

'That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members and that leave of the House be granted under rule 81 for the Select Committee to consist of more than fifteen persons :—

The Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
Sri K. Rajaram.
,, S. Narayanappa.
,, G. Sivasankara Reddi.
,, P. Venkatasubbiah.
,, Ramasundara Karunalaya Pandiyan.
,, S. Jayarama Reddiar.
,, A. Sambasivam.
,, G. Latchanna.
,, C. V. Somayajulu.
,, T. Viswanatham.
,, N. Rathina Gounder.
,, K. Govinda Rao.
,, K. Venkaiah.
,, Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah.
,, K. R. Viswanathan.
,, R. Siddanna Gowd.' "

[a] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 21st July 1952.

[31st July 1952

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

'That the Madras Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill, 1952, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members and that leave of the House be granted under rule 81 for the Select Committee to consist of more than fifteen persons :—

The Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.

Sri K. Rajaram.
,, S. Narayanappa.
,, G. Sivasankara Reddi.
,, P. Venkatasubbiah.
,, Ramasundara Karunalaya Pandiyan.
,, S. Jayarama Reddiar.
,, A. Sambasivam.
,, G. Latchanna.
,, C. V. Somayajulu.
,, T. Viswanatham.
,, N. Rathina Gounder.
,, K. Govinda Rao.
,, K. Venkaiah.
,, Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah.
,, K. R. Viswanathan.
,, R. Siddanna Gowd.' "

The motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I appoint the Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker to be the Chairman of the Committee."

(8) THE MADRAS REPEALING AND AMENDING BILL,[a] 1952.

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Sir, I am not moving the Madras Repealing and Amending Bill, 1952, now. I will be moving it in the next session of the Assembly."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, before you adjourn the House, may I submit that the Government should give us an idea when we are going to meet again."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I thought the Hon. Leader of the House has consulted the Leader of the Opposition."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, I would make a suggestion. The work of the Select Committees will take some time; then there are some other important meetings for several of the Congress Members, and they may require about seven days in September;

[a] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 16th July 1952.

31st July 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

therefore, I would suggest that the next sitting may be fixed to take place in the third week of September and you may be pleased to adjourn the House *sine die*."

MR. SPEAKER :—" There is the election to the Council of States and hon. Members will not be paid any travelling allowance for coming here and voting at that election."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, I had that in my mind. Our Government have got a pull with the Government of India and they can change the date if they like."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I will fix a date and adjourn the House. I will convey whatever is said by the Leader of the Opposition to the Leader of the House, and if the meeting is postponed, I will send another notice."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I thought, if you are pleased to adjourn the House *sine die*, it would be more helpful."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I adjourn the House to meet again at 11 a.m. on Saturday, 6th September 1952."

The House then adjourned.

V.—PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

G.O. Ms. No. 2374, *P.W. (Electricity), dated* 2nd *June* 1952, *relating to the acquisition by Government of Sivakasi Municipal Electrical Undertaking and provisional absorption of staff into Government service.*

TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 308 asked by Sri N. Mahalingam at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 31st July 1952, page 716 supra.]

Proceedings of the second meeting of the Committee of Experts on Lignite Investigation set up under G.O. Ms. No. 4591, dated 18th October 1951.

The following attended the meetings of the Committee at Cuddalore and Neyveli on the 15th and 16th November 1951 respectively :—

1 Mr. Paul R. Eyrich,
2 Sri H. K. Ghose,
3 Sri M. S. Balasundaram,
4 Dr. C. V. Subbaratnam.
5 Sri A. R. Narayana Rao and
6 Sri C. Narayanaswamy.

The Committee reviewed the work so far done which included the detailed report on Investigation of Lignite Deposits of South Arcot by Sri H. K. Ghose.

Mr. Krogczy's (Overseas India, Ltd.) report on the development of lignite deposits of South Arcot district,

Inspection of site, plans, boreholes, borehole data and other records arranged by Sri Ghose, and

Drill cores, bulk samples, briquettes, china clay samples and other items were also inspected.

The Committee after a review of the work so far done entered into a discussion and chalked out the following programme of work :—

(a) To study and investigate all problems connected with the exploitation of the lignite deposits;

(b) The economic utilization of lignite;

(c) The economic utilization of bye-products;

(d) To advise Government on all questions relating to the various aspects of mining and ground water problems and measures to tackle them;

(e) Utilization of lignite for various purposes including power production;

(f) Utilization of clays, sands and water.

(g) Land and irrigation problems; and

(h) All other questions that may be referred to them.

31st July 1952]

The following general procedure was outlined :—

(i) To request the experts on the various branches to submit a detailed note on the procedure and programme they would like to adopt regarding their future work.

(ii) To advise the Government by sending an interim report regarding immediate taking up of the pilot scheme which ultimately would enable adequate data to be collected for further development.

Referring to item (ii) of the previous paragraph, i.e., about the pilot scheme, Dr. Paul R. Eyrich has thoroughly examined the scheme with the available data that has been furnished by Mr. H. K. Ghose and by personal observations and deductions feels that no time should be lost in launching the pilot scheme operation and feels that it will be a perfectly feasible proposition. The other experts of the Committee in consultation with the Power Engineer and the Irrigation Engineer accept the basic principles.

It is the considered view of the Committee that work on pilot scheme and investigation of ground water problem, study of economics and utilization of the products should go side by side.

To enable the Government to have an approximate idea of the cost involved, a detailed scheme has been drawn up by Sri Ghose with necessary drawings, blue prints and estimates. These are appended* along with the report. The approximate cost of the scheme is expected to be around 65 lakhs. The merits of the pilot scheme are discussed below :—

To assess and evaluate the problems that would arise in raising the lignite and to give data for future work, a portion of the lignite area that has been delienated in the enclosed* plan has been taken up for this purpose. This has been chosen due to the following reasons :—

(*a*) The area has sufficiently been proved by trial borings to give the advantageous ratio of lignite to over-burden of 1 : 3 to begin with;

(*b*) It is proposed to mark out an area of about 500 feet by 500 feet in near proximity of the existing pit No. 3. This is estimated to yield about 20,000 tons of lignite.

The Committee realizes that it may be difficult to get all the equipments in India. The work can start with all machinery, materials and equipment that are available in the country or that could be obtained immediately.

Side by side with the pilot mining project a pilot plant for processing the lignite should be established.—

(*a*) To briquette and carbonize the lignite and *vice versa*;

(*b*) To extract Montan Wax from lignite;

(*c*) To establish an organization to study and experiment the economics and marketing and utilization of this to various industries;

* Not printed.

[31st July 1952

(*d*) Setting up of a Thermal Power Station in the neighbourhood of the mining site for supplying power to the mines and also to serve as demonstration and experimental unit to develop the lignite.

The Committee after consideration of the data and after personal inspection support the above pilot scheme unanimously.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE LIGNITE HIGH POWER COMMITTEE MEETING.

Date : 16th January 1952.

Summary of discussions and conclusions reached.

1. Members of the High Power Committee with their Secretary met at Chepauk in the Library Hall of the Office of the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, to consider the report of the Expert Committee and other matters mentioned in the agenda enclosed.*

2. Members of the Expert Committee were also present. Hon'ble the Minister for Industries, Hon'ble the Minister for Revenue, Secretary to Government, Development Department, and the Chief Construction Engineer (Electricity Department) were also present by invitation.

3. The Expert Committee and other members present gave their views on the scheme of experimental open pit quarrying, and on the other general features connected with mining and use of lignite.

4. After the preliminary discussions were over, the members of the Expert Committee withdrew and the High Power Committee considered the several items on the agenda and discussed them one by one. Hon'ble the Ministers, and the Secretary, Development Department, were, however, also requested to be present for this.

5. The following decisions were taken :—

(1) A scheme for the experimental open pit quarrying be recommended to Government for the following reasons :—

(*a*) South India was extremely short of coal which was only available in small and inadequate quantities even for existing needs due to transport difficulties over long distances a problem for which no immediate solution was possible unless the line of the East Coast was doubled which is a costly and long term project. The cost of such coal as was so transported was almost prohibitive. Due to these factors, there was no future for industries in South India, unless the lignite in South Arcot was developed. This lignite was a high-grade product unlike some of the inferior varieties of coal received from coal fields. Large industrial developments would follow once lignite was mined and marketed.

(*b*) Investigation had reached a stage when all possible data obtainable from bore holes and shafts had been obtained and further data of a nature useful for large scale mining could only be obtained by open pit excavations on a field scale. This experimental work had to be done at some time or other with all the

* Not printed.

31st July 1952]

attendant risks. The problems arising out of the excavation and mining should be dealt with as they rose if they cannot be foreseen and all scientific and laboratory resources applied towards solving difficult and unusual problems. It was realized that the water and soil slope stability factors were unpredictable, and might prove possibly more difficult than assumed or encountered anywhere else in the world, but that these risks had to be taken in a work which was experimental. It was for this reason that the scheme was also characterized as experimental.

The High Power Committee considered that the responsibility for the decision should be taken fully by Government in view of the possible loss that the scheme would involve in the event of the experiment proving a failure due to insuperable difficulties.

(2) The scheme should be worked out as far as possible in stages so as to minimize losses, if any, and to plan that would not affect the general plan for full scale development. The work might be done on contract through people who have necessary experience and large amount of equipment available with them already. Government should, however, provide pumping, grouting and other equipment to supplement the contractor's equipment as necessary.

(3) A Control Board should be established, and this Board should control the several features of the experimental open pit excavation including acquisition of machinery needed for the scheme, and should watch the progress of the work, and make modifications to the scheme as work progresses and more data come to light.

(4) The cost of the scheme of Rs. 65 lakhs was tentative and not based on detailed estimates; it would be liable to a possible reduction if the work was done on contract, the contractor bringing his own machinery and to an increase if work was all done departmentally with departmental machinery. At this stage, it was undesirable to take credit for the cost of China clay expected to be recovered in the excavation. The whole scheme should be treated as debitable to experiment and research. A figure will be worked out and reported separately for purposes of financial sanction.

(5) It was not necessary to call in Mr. Beck or any other expert like Dr. Terzaghi or other German Engineers till the excavation had proceeded to a definite stage when some of them could be called in if necessary.

(6) Consideration of the question of transfer of the old Power Plant from Basin Bridge to the site might be deferred; in the meanwhile Diesel standby sets to the extent of pumping needs may be obtained as necessary. A new power line should be built by Electricity Department at their cost to increase the amount of power available at Neyveli.

(7) The grant of concessions to private enterprises worked partly with Government capital, such as those applied for by Messrs. Seshasayee and Parry & Co., might be considered after the policy of the Government of India in such matters was known.

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 318 asked by Sri K. Krishna Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 31st July 1952, page 721 supra.]

The daily allowance admissible to police constables for railway journeys and for halts on tour is as follows :—

	RS.	A.	P.
(i) Ordinary rate	0	12	0
(ii) During rail journey outside district ..	1	0	0
(iii) Halts outside province	1	4	0
(iv) During railway journey outside province.	2	0	0
(v) During railway journey to Delhi	3	0	0
(vi) Halt at Delhi	2	4	0

APPENDIX III.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 320 asked by Sri V. Balakrishnan at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 31st July 1952, page 723 supra.]

Statement showing the headquarters and jurisdiction of Assistant Inspectors of Labour.

The headquarters and jurisdiction fixed for the Assistant Inspectors of Labour are as shown below :—

Serial number and headquarters and circle of Assistant Inspector of Labour. (1)	*Jurisdiction.* (2)
	NORTH ARCOT DISTRICT.
1 Tiruppattur ..	Tiruppattur (taluk) except Vaniyambadi (M) and Alangayam (MP).
2 Ambur ..	Ambur (M) and Pernambut (MP).
3 Vaniyambadi ..	Vaniyambadi (M) and Alangayam (MP).
4 Gudiyattam ..	Gudiyattam (taluk) except Pernambut (MP).
5 Vellore I ..	Municipal Electrical Wards Nos. 1 to 3 and 7 to 15 of the Vellore (M).
6 Vellore II ..	Vellore (taluk) except Ambur (M).
7 Wallajapet ..	Arkonam (taluk), Wallajapet (M) and Sholinghur (MP).
8 Tiruvannamalai ..	Tiruvannamalai and Chengam (taluks).
9 Arcot	Wallajapet (taluk) except Wallajapet (M) and Sholinghur (MP).
10 Wandiwash ..	Cheyyar and Wandiwash (taluks).
11 Arni	Polur and Arni (taluks) except Chetput (MP).
	CHINGLEPUT AND SOUTH ARCOT DISTRICTS.
1 Madras	Ponneri and Saidapet (taluks) excluding Madras City.
2 Tiruvallur ..	Tiruvallur and Sriperumbudur (taluks).
3 Kancheepuram I.	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 14 of Kancheepuram (M).
4 Kancheepuram II.	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 15 to 27 of Kancheepuram (M).
5 Chingleput ..	Chingleput and Kancheepuram (taluks) excluding Kancheepuram (M).
6 Tindivanam ..	Madurantakam, Tindivanam and Gingee (taluks).
7 Villupuram ..	Villupuram and Tirukkoyilur (taluks).
8 Cuddalore I ..	Cuddalore (M).
9 Cuddalore II ..	Cuddalore (taluk) excluding Cuddalore (M) and Porto Novo (MP).
10 Chidambaram ..	Chidambaram (taluk) excluding Porto Novo (MP).
11 Vriddachalam ..	Vriddachalam and Kallakurichi (taluks).

31st July 1952]

Serial number and head-quarters and circle of Assistant Inspector of Labour. (1)	*Jurisdiction.* (2)
	ANANTAPUR DISTRICT.
1 Guntakkal	Gooty (taluk) excluding Gooty (MP).
2 Tadpatri	Tadpatri (taluk) and Gooty (MP).
3 Anantapur	Anantapur and Kalyandrug (taluks).
4 Dharmavaram ..	Dharmavaram, Kadiri and Penukonda (taluks).
5 Hindupur	Hindupur and Madakasira (taluks).
	CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
1 Chittoor	Chittoor (taluk).
2 Tirupati	Chandragiri (taluk).
3 Kalahasti	Kalahasti, Puttur and Tiruttani (taluks).
4 Madanappalle ..	Madanapallee and Vayalpad (taluks),
5 Palamaner	Punganur, Palamaner and Kangundi (taluks).
	BELLARY DISTRICT.
1 Adoni	Adoni, Siruguppa and Alur (taluks).
2 Bellary	Bellary and Rayadrug (taluks).
3 Hospet	Hospet (taluk).
4 Kottur	Kudligi, Hadagalli and Harpanahalli (taluks), former Sandur State Territory.
	COIMBATORE DISTRICT.
1 Coimbatore I ..	Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 10 of Coimbatore (M).
2 Coimbatore II ..	Electoral Wards Nos. 11 to 19 of Coimbatore (M).
3 Coimbatore III ..	Electoral Wards Nos. 20 to 26 of Coimbatore (M).
4 Coimbatore IV ..	Coimbatore (taluk) excluding Coimbatore (M) and Perianaickenpalayam and Vellaikinar (MPs) and Sulur (MP).
5 Mettupalayam ..	Avanashi (taluk) and Periyanaickenpalayam and Vellaikinar (MPs).
6 Tiruppur	Palladam (taluk) excluding Sulur (MP).
7 Dharapuram ..	Dharapuram (taluk).
8 Pollachi I	Pollachi (M).
9 Pollachi II ..	Pollachi (taluk) excluding Pollachi (M).
10 Udamalpet ..	Udamalpet (M).
11 Erode I	Erode (M).
12 Erode II	Erode and Bhavani (taluks) excluding Erode (M).
13 Gobichettipalayam.	Gobichettipalayam and Kollegal (taluks).
	EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
1 Kakinada I ..	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 13, 15 and 16 of Kakinada (M).
2 Kakinada II ..	Kakinada (taluk) excluding Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 13, 15 and 16 of Kakinada (M).
3 Rajahmundry I ..	Rajahmundry (taluk) excluding Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 6 and 17 and 22 to 24 of Rajahmundry (M)
4 Rajahmundry II ..	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 6 to 17 and 22 to 24 of Rajahmundry (M).
5 Peddapuram ..	Peddapuram, Pithapuram and Tuni (taluks).
6 Amalapuram ..	Amalapuram and Razole (taluks).
7 Ramachandrapuram.	Ramachandrapuram (taluk).
	WEST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
1 Eluru I	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 17 of Eluru (M).
2 Eluru II	Eluru (taluk) excluding Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 17 of Eluru (M) and Chintalapudi (taluk).
3 Tadepallegudem ..	Kovvur and Tadepallegudem (taluks).
4 Bhimavaram ..	Bhimavaram taluk.
5 Palacole	Palacole (M) and Narasapur (MP).
6 Tanuku	Tanuku and Narasapur (taluk) excepting Palacole (M) and Narasapur (MP).

Serial number and head-quarters and circle of Assistant Inspector of Labour. (1)	*Jurisdiction.* (2)
	GUNTUR DISTRICT.
1 Guntur I	Guntur (M).
2 Guntur II	Guntur (taluk) excluding Guntur (M), Sattenapalle and Palnad (taluks).
3 Narasaraopet ..	Narasaraopet and Vinukonda (taluk).
4 Tenali I	Tenali (M).
5 Tenali II	Tenali (taluk) excluding Tenali (M) and Repalli (taluk).
6 Chirala	Bapatla (taluk).
7 Ongole	Ongole (taluk).
	KRISHNA DISTRICT.
1 Vijayavada I ..	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 9, 12 and 13 of Vijayavada (M) and Nandigama (taluk).
2 Vijayavada II ..	Electoral Wards Nos. 10 and 11 of Vijayavada (M) and Nuzvid and Gannavaram (taluks).
3 Vijayavada III ..	Vijayavada (taluk) excluding Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 14 of Vijayavada (M)
4 Gudivada	Gudivada and Kaikalur (taluks).
5 Masulipatnam I ..	Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 11 and 13 to 22 of Masulipatnam (M).
6 Masulipatnam II ..	Bandar (taluk) excluding Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 11 and 13 to 22 of Masulipatnam (M) and Divi (taluk).
	KURNOOL DISTRICT.
1 Nandyal	Nandyal, Banganapalle, Koilkuntla and Sirvel (taluks).
2 Kurnool I ..	Kurnool (M).
3 Kurnool II ...	Nandikotkur, Pattikonda, Dhone and Kurnool (taluks) excluding Kurnool (M).
4 Markapur	Markapur and Cumbum (taluks).
	CUDDAPAH DISTRICT.
1 Cuddapah ..	Cuddapah Kamalapuram and Pulivendla (taluks).
2 Proddatur ..	Proddatur and Jammalamadugu (taluks).
3 Rajampet	Rajampet, Siddhavattam, Badvel and Rayachoti (taluks).
	MADURAI DISTRICT.
1 Madurai I	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 2 to 5 of Madurai (M).
2 Madurai II ..	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 6, 7, 9 and 10 of Madurai (M).
3 Madurai III ..	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 15 to 17 of Madurai (M).
4 Madurai IV ..	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1, 11, 12, 18 to 22 and 28 of Madurai (M).
5 Madurai V ..	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 13 and 14 of Madurai (M).
6 Madurai VI ..	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 23 to 27 of Madurai (M).
7 Madurai VII ..	Madurai (taluk) excluding Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 7 and 9 to 27 of Madurai (M) and Melur (taluk).
8 Kodaikanal ..	Kodaikanal and Nilakkottai (taluks).
9 Dindigul I ..	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 9 of Dindigul (M).
10 Dindigul II ..	Dindigul (taluk) excluding Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 9 of Dindigul (M).
11 Palni	Palni (taluk).
12 Usilampatti ..	Tirumangalam (taluk).
13 Periyakulam ..	Periyakulam (taluk) excluding Bodinayakanur, Thevaram, Kombai, Chinnamanur, Uthamapalayam, Gudalur and Kammayagoundanpatti (MPs.).
14 Bodinayakanur ..	Bodinayakanur, Thevaram, Kombai and Chinnamanur (MPs).
15 Kambam	Kambam, Uthamapalayam, Gudalur and Kammayagoundanpatti (MPs).
	SOUTH KANARA DISTRICT.
1 Udipi	Udipi and Coondapur (taluks).
2 Mangalore I ..	Karkal and Mangalore (taluks) excluding Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 13 to 25 of Mangalore (M).
3 Mangalore II ..	Kasaragod and Puttur (taluks) and Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 13 to 25 of Mangalore (M).

31st July 1952]

Serial number and headquarters and circle of Assistant Inspector of Labour.	*Jurisdiction.*
(1)	(2)
	MALABAR DISTRICT.
1 Shoranur	Walluvanad, Ernad and Ponnani (taluks).
2 Palghat I	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 18 of Palghat (M).
3 Palghat II ..	Palghat (taluk) excluding Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 18 of Palghat (M).
4 Fort Cochin ..	Fort Cochin (M).
5 Kozhikode I ..	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 7 of Kozhikode (M).
6 Kozhikode II ..	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 8 to 14 of Kozhikode (M).
7 Kozhikode III ..	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 15 to 20 of Kozhikode (M).
8 Kozhikode IV ..	Wynaad and Kozhikode (taluks) excluding Kozhikode (M), Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 20 and Vayithiri (MP).
9 Badagara.. ..	Kurumbranad (taluk) excluding Vayithiri (MP).
10 Tellicherry ..	Kottayam (taluk).
11 Cannanore I ..	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 10 of Cannanore (M).
12 Cannanore II ..	Chirakkal (taluk) excluding Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 10 of Cannanore (M).
	NILGIRI DISTRICT.
1 Ootacamund ..	Ootacamund and Gudalur (taluks).
2 Coonoor	Coonoor (taluk).
	NELLORE DISTRICT.
1 Nellore I	Nellore (taluk) excluding Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 16 to 24 of Nellore (M), and Atmakur (taluk).
2 Nellore II ..	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 16 to 24 of Nellore (M) and Kovur (taluk).
3 Kavali	Kavali, Kandukur, Udayagiri, Darsi and Podili (taluks).
4 Gudur	Gudur, Venkatagiri, Sulurpet and Rapur (taluks).
	RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT.
1 Virudhunagar ..	Virudhunagar (M).
2 Sivakasi	Sattur (taluk) excluding Virudhunagar (M).
3 Srivilliputhur ..	Srivilliputhur (M), Watrap (MP).
4 Rajapalayam ..	Srivilliputhur (taluk) excluding Srivilliputhur (M) and Watrap (MP).
5 Aruppukkottai ..	Aruppukkottai (taluk).
6 Karaikudi ..	Karaikudi (M).
7 Tiruppattur ..	Karaikudi (M), Tiruppattur (taluk) excluding Karaikudi (M).
8 Devakottai ..	Tiruvadanai (taluk) and Sivaganga (MP) and Nattarasankottai (MP).
9 Manamathurai ..	Sivaganga (taluk) excluding Sivaganga (MP) and Nattarasankottai (MP), Paramakudi (taluk) excluding Paramakudi (MP) and Mudukulathur (taluk).
10 Ramnathapuram..	Ramanathapuram (taluk) and Paramakudi (MP).
	SALEM DISTRICT.
1 Salem III	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 13 to 19 of Salem (M).
2 Salem I	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 5 of Salem (M).
3 Salem IV	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 20 to 27 of Salem (M).
4 Salem V	Salem (taluk) excluding Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 10 and 13 to 27 of Salem (M) and Attur taluk.
5 Salem II	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 6 to 10 of Salem (M).
6 Tiruchengode ..	Tiruchengode, Omalur and Mettur (taluks).
7 Krishnagiri ..	Krishnagiri and Hosur (taluks).
8 Dharmapuri ..	Dharmapuri and Harur (taluks).
9 Rasipuram ..	Rasipuram and Namakkal (taluks).
	TIRUCHIRAPPALLI DISTRICT.
1 Tiruchirappalli I ..	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 4, 22 and 24 to 27 of Tiruchirapalli (M).
2 Tiruchirappalli II	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 5 to 9 and 21 of Tiruchirappalli (M).
3 Tiruchirappalli III.	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 10 to 14 and 18 to 20 of Tiruchirappalli (M).

[31st July 1952

Serial number and head-quarters and circle of Assistant Inspector of Labour.	Jurisdiction.
(1)	(2)
	TIRUCHIRAPPALLI DISTRICT—*cont.*
4 Tiruchirappalli IV.	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 15 to 17 and 23 of Tiruchirappalli (M).
5 Srirangam ..	Tiruchirappalli (taluk) excluding Tiruchirappalli (M).
6 Karur	Karur (M).
7 Kulittalai ..	Karur (taluk) excluding Karur (M) and Kulittalai (taluk).
8 Tiruchirappalli V.	Lalgudi (taluk) and Turaiyur (MP) in Musiri (taluk).
9 Ariyalur	Udayarpalayam and Parambalur (taluks).
10 Musiri	Musiri (taluk) except Turaiyur (MP).
11 Pudukkottai ..	Alangudi (taluk).
12 Pudukkottai II ..	Tirumayam (taluk) and Kulathur (taluk).
	TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.
1 Tenkasi	Sankarankoil and Tenkasi (taluks).
2 Tuticorin I ..	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 14 of Tuticorin (M).
3 Tuticorin II ..	Electoral Wards Nos. 15 to 22 and 25 of Tuticorin (M).
4 Kovilpatti ..	Kovilpatti (taluk) and Electoral Wards Nos. 23 and 24 of Tuticorin (M).
5 Tirunelveli ..	Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 6, 8, 11, 20 of Tirunelveli (M).
6 Palayamkottai ..	Tirunelveli (taluk) excluding Melapalayam (M) and Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 7, 9, 10 and 21 to 27 of Tirunelveli (M).
7 Melapalayam ..	Melapalayam (M) and Nanguneri (taluk).
8 Srivaikuntam ..	Srivaikuntam excluding Tuticorin (M) and Tiruchendur (taluk).
9 Ambasamudram ..	Ambasamudram (taluk).
	TANJORE DISTRICT.
1 Tanjore I	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 10 of Tanjore (M), Vallam (MP).
2 Tanjore II ..	Tanjore (M), Electoral Wards Nos. 11 to 28 and Orathanad (MP).
3 Tanjore III ..	Tanjore (taluk) excepting Vallam (MP) and Papanasam (taluk).
4 Kumbakonam I ..	Kumbakonam (M), Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 18.
5 Kumbakonam II.	Kumbakonam (taluk) excluding Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 18 of Kumbakonam (M).
6 Mayuram ..	Mayuram and Sirkali (taluks).
7 Nagapattinam ..	Nagapattinam (M).
8 Tiruvarur ..	Nannilam and Nagapattinam (taluks) excluding Nagapattinam (M).
9 Mannargudi ..	Mannargudi (taluk).
10 Tiruturaipundi ..	Tiruturaipundi (taluk).
11 Pattukottai ..	Pattukkottai (taluk) excluding Orathanad (MP) and Arantangi (taluk).
	VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.
1 Anakapalli ..	Anakapalli and Sarvasiddhi (taluk).
2 Narasapatnam ..	Golugunda and Viravilli (taluks).
3 Visakhaptnam I ..	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 12 of Visakhapatnam (M).
4 Visakhapatnam II.	Visakhapatnam (taluk) excluding Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 12 of Visakhapatnam (M).
5 Vijayanagaram I.	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 8 to 27 of Vijayanagaram (M) and Vijayanagaram (taluk).
6 Vijayanagaram II.	Municipal Electoral Wards Nos. 1 to 7 of Vijayanagaram (M), Srungavarapukota (taluk) and Bheemunipatnam (taluk).
7 Bobbili	Bobbili, Salur and Parvatipur (taluks).
8 Srikakulam ..	Srikakulam, Palkonda and Chipurupalli (taluks).
9 Tekkali	Tekkali, Patapatnam, Sompeta and Ichchapuram taluks.
	MADRAS CORPORATION DIVISIONS.
1 I Circle	1, 4, 5, 6 and 20.
2 II Circle	2 and 3.
3 III Circle	19, 21 and 22.
4 IV Circle	7 and 18.
5 V Circle	8, 16 and 27.
6 VI Circle	9 and 15.
7 VII Circle ..	10 and 11.

31st July 1952]

Serial number and head quarters and circle of Assistant Inspector of Labour.	*Jurisdiction.*
(1)	(2)
	MADRAS CORPORATION DIVISIONS—*cont*.
8 VIII Circle ..	12 and part of division 14 [north by Parish Venkatatchala Ayyar street (a), east by Popham's Broadway (a), south by Subhas Chandra Bose Road and west by Anderson street (a). Chinna Thambi street (a) and Muthu Naicken street (a)].
9 IX Circle	13.
10 X Circle	28.
11 XI Circle ..	Part of division 14 (north by Parish Venkatachala Ayyar street (a), east by Muthunayakan street, Chinnathambi street and Anderson street, south by Subhas Chandra Bose Road and west by Varada Muthiappa street (a).]
12 XII Circle ..	26.
13 XIII Circle ..	23 and 25.
14 XIV Circle ..	17 and 24.
15 XV Circle ..	29 and 30.
16 XVI Circle ..	32, 33, 34 and 35.
17 XVII Circle ..	31 and 39.
18 XVIII Circle ..	40, 41 and 42.
19 XIX Circle ..	37, 38 and 43.
20 XX Circle ..	36, 46, 47 and 48.
21 XXI Circle ..	44, 45, 49 and 50.

(a) indicates both sides of the road.

(M) denotes municipality.

(MP) denotes major panchayat area.

Appendix IV.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 8 asked by Sri M. Narayana Kurup at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 31st July 1952, page, 726 supra.]

Statement showing the expenditure incurred by the Government from April 1940 till 31st March 1952 on account of industrial development in each district of this State.

Name of the district.	Grant of loans.	Subsidies.	Subscription of shares.	Commercial concerns.			Industrial institutions.	Total.		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)			(6)	(7)		
	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	RS.	A.	P.
Madras	16,95,000	2,000	2,00,000	17,23,647	10	2	43,07,078	79,27,225	10	2
Bellary	7,50,000	..	..	..			7,85,902	15,35,902	0	0
Anantapur	3,25,000	2,000	..	..			5,23,636	8,50,636	0	0
Cuddapah	..	..	..	..			..	..		
Chittoor	8,16,500	..	..	..			..	8,16,500	0	0
Chingleput	5,000	..	..	..			..	5,000	0	0
Coimbatore	14,25,000	..	..	37,56,780	12	0	5,44,559	57,26,339	12	0
East Godavari	..	..	..	42,02,939	5	3	6,98,088	49,01,027	5	3
Guntur	11,80,000	..	..	..			..	11,80,000	0	0
Kurnool	10,000	..	..	..			..	10,000	0	0
Krishna	1,67,000	..	..	..			2,83,190	4,50,190	0	0
Malabar	4,00,000	3,000	..	1,36,56,296	9	7	20,22,281	1,60,81,577	9	7
Madurai	..	..	..	..			10,35,031	10,35,031	0	0
Nellore	..	..	..	3,32,158	12	11	..	3,32,158	12	11
North Arcot	15,84,000	..	..	..			..	15,84,000	0	0
Nilgiris	..	..	..	..			..	..		
Ramanathapuram	4,75,000	..	..	..			..	4,75,000	0	0
Srikakulam	..	..	..	..			..	..		
South Arcot	..	..	..	..			21,83,858	21,83 858	0	0
South Kanara	48,320	..	..	..			6,73,120	7,21,440	0	0
Salem	5,900	..	..	..			..	5,900	0	0
Tanjore	..	..	..	..			..	..		
Tiruchirappalli	..	..	..	..			..	..		
Tirunelveli	5,00,000	..	..	..			..	5,00,000	0	0
Visakhapatnam	4,50,000	..	..	..			..	4,50,000	0	0
West Godavari	78,000	3,000	..	..			..	81,000	0	0

TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

31st July 1952]

APPENDIX V.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 11 asked by Sri M. Kalyanasundaram at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 31st July 1952, page 729 supra.]

Names of journals and presses from which security was demanded during the years 1947–1952.	Amount of security demanded.	Whether the security has been forfeited.	Reasons for demand of security [(a), (b), (c) or (d) as explained in the footnote].	Circumstances under which forfeiture was ordered.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	RS.			
		1947.		
Deshabhimani, Malayalam Newspaper, Kozhikode.	4,000	Yes, it has been ordered to be forfeited.	(b)	For persisting in the publication of objectionable matter of the kind described in section 4 (1) of the Indian Press (Emergency Powers) Act, 1931.
Do.	10,000	Yes, it has been ordered to be forfeited but since ordered to be refunded under the High Court's orders.	(b)	Do.
S.I. Railway Labour Press, Golden Rock, Tiruchirappalli.	3,000	Yes, it has been ordered to be forfeited.	(b)	Do.
Sengodi, Madras.	500	No.	(d)	
Janasakthi, Tamil weekly, Madras.	2,000	No.	(d)	
Jananayagam, Tamil monthly, Madras.	400	No.	(d)	..
Janasakthi Press, Madras.	500	No.	(c)	..
Ethiroli, Tamil weekly, Madras.	1,000	No.	(d)	..
Samadharmam, Tamil weekly, Madras.	600	No.	(d)	..
Ethayaoli, Tamil weekly, Madras.	500	No.	(d)	..
Prajasakti, Telugu, Vijayavada.	2,000	No.	(b)	..
Suprabhatham, Telugu weekly, Madras.	500	No.	(d)	..

[31st July 1952

Names of journals and presses from which security was demanded during the years 1947–1952.	Amount of security demanded.	Whether the security has been forfeited.	Reasons for demand of security [(a), (b), (c) or (d) as explained in the footnote].	Circumstances under which forfeiture was ordered.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	RS.			
		1947—*cont.*		
'Onward' English weekly, Madras.	500	No.	(*d*)	..
Communist, Kozhikode	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..
Dharma Veeran, Tamil weekly, Madras.	500	No.	(*d*)	..
Press Worker, Tamil monthly, Madras.	500	No.	(*d*)	..
		1948.		
Poratam, Tamil weekly, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..
Janasakthi, Tamil daily, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..
Thuramugha Thozhilali, Tamil fortnightly, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..
Thozhilali, Tamil fortnightly, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..
Chandrika, Kozhikode.	2,000	No.	(*b*)	..
Delhi Chale, Tamil periodical, Madurai.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..
Viduthalai, Tamil daily, Madras.	2,000	Yes, it has been ordered to be forfeited.	(*d*)	For persisting in the publication of objectionable matter of the kind falling within the scope of the Indian Press (Emergency Powers) Act, 1931.
Revolution, English monthly, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..
Mazdoor, Tamil fortnightly, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..

TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

31st July 1952]

Names of journals and presses from which security was demanded during the years. 1947–1952.	Amount of security demanded.	Whether the security has been forfeited.	Reasons for demand of security. [(a), (b), (c) or (d) as explained in the footnote.]	Circumstances under which forfeiture was ordered.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	RS.			
		1948—*cont.*		
Kudi Arasu, Tamil, Newspaper, Coimbatore.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..
Herald, English, fortnightly, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..
Kilarchy, Tamil, fortnightly, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..
		1949.		
Mazdoor, Telugu, fortnightly, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..
Jai Hind, Tamil, fortnightly, Madurai.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..
The Cuddapah Times, Telugu, weekly, Cuddapah.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..
Swathandramani, Tamil, weekly, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..
Janatha, Malayalam, weekly, Malabar.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..
Rashmi, Malayalam, weekly, Malabar.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..
Swaraj, Malayalam, weekly, Malabar.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..
Swatandra India, Tamil, weekly, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	..
Nanneri, Tamil, Newspaper, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*b*)	..
Sri Dhanalakshmi Press, Rasipuram, Salem.	500	No.	(*a*)	—
Sempirai, Tamil, weekly, Madras.	500	No.	(*d*)	—

Names of journals and presses from which security was demanded during the years 1947–1952.	Amount of security demanded.	Whether the security has been forfeited.	Reasons for demand of security. [(a), (b), (c) or (d) as explained in the footnote.]	Circumstances under which forfeiture was ordered.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	RS.			
		1949—*cont.*		
Kabeer Printing Works, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*a*)	..
Mercantile Press, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*a*)	
Nalanda Press, Tenali, Guntur.	1,000	No.	(*a*)	
Viswanath Press, Anantapur.	1,000	No.	(*a*)	
Bhadranath Press, Tadpatri.	1,000	No.	(*a*)	
Prabhakar Press, Anantapur.	1,000	No.	(*a*)	
Munnani, Tamil, weekly, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*b*)	
Sengundha Mitran Press, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*a*)	
Janatha Press, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*a*)	
Dravida Nadu, Kancheepuram.	3,000	No.	(*b*)	
Dharmika Hindu, Tamil, Newspaper, Saidapet.	2,000	No	(*b*)	
Viduthalai, Tamil, daily, Madras.	10,000	No.	(*b*)	
Kudi Arasu, Tamil Newspaper, Coimbatore.	3,000	No.	(*b*)	
Sri Nataraja Press, Turaiyur, Tiruchirappalli.	1,500	No.	(*b*)	
		1950.		
Vignanam, Telugu, weekly, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*b*)	
Arcot Press, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*c*)	
Samala Press, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*a*)	
Porani, Madras.	1,000	No.	(*d*)	
Avanthi Press, South Kanara.	2,000	No.	(*a*)	
Cinema Jothi, Tamil, weekly, Madurai.	1,000	No	(*d*)	
India Thai Press, Madurai.	5,000	No.	(*a*)	
Albayan, Arabic, weekly, Malabar.	500	No.	(*d*)	
Sri Vasavi Press, Markapur, Kurnool.	2,000	No.	(*a*)	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

Names of journals and presses from which security was demanded during the years 1947–1952.	Amount of security demanded.	Whether the security has been forfeited.	Reasons for demand of security. [(a), (b), (c) or (d) as explained in the footnote.]	Circumstances under which forfeiture was ordered.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	RS.			
		1950—*cont.*		
Murthy Printing Press, Madras.	3,000	No.	(a)	..
Madras Ripon Press, Pudukkottai.	1,000	No.	(a)	..
Renaissance Printing, Limited, Madras.	1,000	No.	(a)	..
Dravida Nadu, Madras.	1,000	No.	(d)	—
		1951.		
Chandrika, Malayalam.	1,000	No.	(d)	..
Hajiji Press, Salem.	500	No.	(a)	..
Aruna, Kannada, weekly, Mangalore.	1,000	No.	(b)	..
Jaya Bharat Press.	1,000	No.	(a)	..
National Printing Press, Vijayavada.	500	No.	(d)	..
Nehru Press, Madras.	1,000	No.	(d)	..
Ulaga Arasiyal, Madras.	1,000	No.	(d)	..
		1952.		
South Indian Litho Press, Ltd., Tuticorin, Tirunelveli.	1,000	No.	(a)	..

NOTE.—The Government have ordered the refund of all the securities deposited under the Indian Press (Emergency Powers) Act, 1931 and which have not so far been returned or forfeited.

NOTE.—(*a*) For printing objectionable matter of the kind described in section 4 (1) of the Indian Press (Emergency Powers) Act, 1931.

(*b*) For publishing objectionable matter of the kind described in section 4 (1) of the Indian Press (Emergency Powers) Act, 1931.

(*c*) A security was demanded under section 3 (1) of the Indian Press (Emergency Powers) Act, 1931, as it was apprehended that objectionable matter of the kind described in section 4 (1) of the Indian Press (Emergency Powers) Act, 1931, would be printed.

(*d*) A security was demanded under section 3 (1) of the Indian Press (Emergency Powers) Act, 1931, as it was apprehended that objectionable matter of the kind described in section 4 (1) of the Indian Press (Emergency Powers) Act, 1931, would be published.

APPENDIX VI.

[*Vide* answer to unstarred question No. 14 asked by Sri . Rajeswara Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 31st July 1952, page 730 supra.]

Revenue derived by the State Government from West Godavari district; during 1951–52.

	Head of account.	*Amount.*
		RS.
VII	Land Revenue	62,01,716
VIII	State Excise Duties	1,79,356
IX	Stamps	32,03,107
X	Forests	* 19,81,746
XI	Registration	3,78,230
XII	Receipts under Motor Vehicles Act	10,39,441
XIII	Other Taxes and Duties	42,46,380
XVII	Irrigation, Navigation Embankment and Drainage Works for which capital accounts are kept.	† 1,11,817
XVIII	Irrigation, Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works for which no capital accounts are kept.	† 5,686
XX	Interest	80,011
XXI	Administration of Justice	4,00,040
XXII	Jails and Convict Settlements	1
XXIII	Police	19,377
XXVI	Education	27,473
XXVII	Medical	10,633
XXVIII	Public Health	7,594
XXIX	Agriculture	4,80,503
XXX	Veterinary	5,944
XXXI	Co-operation	81,159
XXXII	Industries and Supplies	1,49,535
XXXVI	Miscellaneous Departments	1,33,174
XXXIX	Civil Works	† 1,14,856
XLI	Receipts from Electricity Schemes	..
XLIV	Receipts in aid of Superannuation	5,170
XLV	Stationery and Printing	32,956
XLVI	Miscellaneous	1,56,447
XLVI-A	Receipts from Road Transport Schemes	..
L	Miscellaneous Adjustments between Union and State Governments.	..
LI	Extraordinary Receipts	64,416
LII-B	Civil Defence	..
		1,91,16,768

	RS.	A.	P.
* Includes Forest Revenues in Godavari—			
Lower Forest Division	13,28,026	5	8
Upper Forest Division	6,58,086	5	2
	19,86,112	10	10

† Includes figures appearing in the Public Works Accounts of the Godavari West and Godavari Special Divisions.

APPENDIX VII.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 15 asked by Sri M. Rajeswara Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 31st July 1952, page 731 supra.]

Amount spent under the various Well Subsidy Schemes including wells and tanks in South Kanara and Malabar districts.

District.	Wells Scheme, 1944.		Accelerated Scheme.						C.D.A. Schemes.		New Well Subsidy Scheme, 1947–48.	New Well Subsidy Scheme, 1948–49.	New Well Subsidy Scheme, 1949–50.	New Well Subsidy Scheme, 1950–51.	New Well Subsidy Scheme, 1951–52.
	Old wells.	New wells.	New wells.			Old wells.			New wells.	Old wells.					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)			(5)			(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
	RS.	RS.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.
Srikakulam ..	Particulars not available.		14,106	0	0	..			..	..	1,05,000	4,03,300	3,88,500	1,48,500	71,000
Visakhapatnam.			2,65,750	0	0	8,280	0	0		..	4,29,000	3,95,000	3,61,000	1,26,500	2,00,000
East Godavari ..			1,93,450	0	0	7,000	0	0	..	..	1,51,200	2.38,250	2,19,750	1.24,750	..
West Godavari ..			450	0	0	450	0	0	..	..	82,800	1,00,000	1,85,000	83,000	..
Krishna ..			1,26,980	0	0	26,492	0	0	..	..	5,76,600	3,65,750	4,50,000	1,74,750	..
Guntur			1,87,198	0	0	46,332	0	0	..	..	6,30,475	7,00,000	5,17,500	1,92,000	..
Nellore			7,71,258	0	0	3,62,910	0	0	..	..	6,12,350	7,72,050	6,20,750	2,15,000	1,99,500
Cuddapah ..			2,33,085	0	0	34,805	0	0	1,12,840	1,800	5,17,600	6,13,000	5,49,350	2,07,750	..
Kurnool ..			1,16,717	0	0	63,091	0	0	1,35,870	33,570	6,40,720	5,97,800	4,22,500	2,10,000	..
Bellary ..			77,370	0	0	35,219	0	0	3,48,855	26,237	3,41,950	2,97,500	2,49,600	1,41,500	..
Anantapur ..			2,57,963	0	0	1,10,516	0	0	4,07,325	90,980	7,02,410	6,51,200	5,42,950	2,07,750	..
Chittoor ..			17,90,700	0	0	5,41,087	0	0	..	..	10,15,490	14,00,250	10,65,500	6,65,750	6,25,000
Chingleput ..			26,74,753	0	0	4,34,059	0	0	..	..	9,12,865	14,75,000	11,50,000	5,46,300	6,83,700
North Arcot ..			32,04,910	0	0	12,24,735	0	0	..	..	3,17,870	5,00,000	11,17,650	5,45,000	8,87,500
South Arcot ..			11,14,650	0	0	1,21,020	0	0	..	..	10,33,550	12,74,850	10,74,450	5,75,000	1,02,500
Tanjore ..			3,76,837	8	0	25,090	0	0	..	..	9,200	23,310	50,000	33,000	..
Tiruchirappalli.			10,36,705	0	0	1,09,522	0	0	..	..	18,96,000	13,60,900	10,22,000	5,08,000	65,000
Coimbatore ..			7,64,700	0	0	2,50,700	0	0	..	..	9,38,700	8,00,000	7,50,000	3,05,000	..
Madurai ..			17,64,250	0	0	1,89,695	0	0	..	..	8,17,370	8,75,000	7,70,000	5,25,000	3,65,000
Ramanathapuram.			13,42,945	0	0	1,10,570	0	0	..	..	18,63,408	13,58,000	10,16,000	6,66,750	2,71,000
Salem ..			11,83,934	0	0	8,77,709	8	0	..	..	13,24,500	14,56,655	11,29,330	5,07,800	..
Tirunelveli ..			10,73,283	8	0	1,14,568	0	0	..	..	11,13,080	9,05,800	9,49,250	6,34,850	3,00,000
South Kanara ..			8,435	0	0	2,095	2	0	..	..	42,530	14,200	19,855	15,600	..
Malabar ..			38,822	0	0	9,166	0	0	..	..	1,59,099	1,11,871	78,015	28,500	..
Total ..	98,500		1,76,05,146	0	0	47,05,111	10	0	10,04,890	1,52,587	1,62,33,767	1,66,89,686	1,46,98,950	73,88,050	37,70,200
												O.T. 2,05,255	O.T. 2,09,315	O.T. 1,15,400	
												N.T. 1,01,399	N.T. 1,40,025	N.T. 90,600	

Number of works subsidized under the Wells Schemes up to May 1952 including wells and tanks in South Kanara and Malabar districts.

District.	1944–45 old scheme.	1945–46 old wells scheme.	1946–47 old wells scheme.	Accelerated scheme.			C.D.M. schemes.		New Well Subsidy scheme 1947–48.			New Well Subsidy scheme 1948–49.			New Well Subsidy scheme 1949–50.			New Well Subsidy scheme 1950–51.			New well subsidy scheme 1951–52
				New wells.	Old wells.	New tanks.	New wells.	Old wells.	New wells.	New tanks.	Old tanks.	New wells.	New tanks.	Old tanks.	New wells.	New tanks.	Old tanks.	New wells.	New tanks.	Old tanks.	New wells.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)
Bellary	..	25	..	262	246	..	709	101	690	..	..	401	..	..	384	..	..	190	..	..	..
Malabar	..	..	..	189	79	..	..	..	165	55	135	394	149	315	234	235	356	95	118	179	..
Visakhapatnam	..	..	..	2,092	223	..	..	..	1,430	..	..	790	..	..	723	..	..	253	..	..	400
South Kanara	..	..	..	53	22	3	..	..	41	43	26	48	22	25	67	48	32	52	64	54	..
Krishna	..	..	..	432	146	..	..	..	1,250	..	..	504	..	..	626	..	..	250	..	..	..
Cuddapah	22	21	1	773	223	..	237	6	1,077	..	..	841	..	..	740	..	..	294	..	..	..
South Arcot	..	..	..	3,811	848	..	..	..	3,508	..	..	2,714	..	..	1,861	..	..	1,021	..	..	204
Tanjore	..	..	..	1,257	156	..	..	..	30	..	..	48	..	..	101	..	..	67	..	..	..
Guntur	..	..	..	629	305	..	..	..	1,993	..	..	1,027	..	..	742	..	..	281	..	..	..
North Arcot	..	..	..	7,944	8,533	..	..	..	1,076	..	..	1,519	..	..	2,452	..	..	940	..	..	1,681
East Godavari	..	..	..	646	54	..	..	..	504	..	..	324	..	..	295	..	..	168	..	..	..
Anantapur	100	58	..	879	745	..	828	320	1,437	..	..	895	..	..	738	..	..	281	..	..	..
Chittoor	..	..	..	5,864	2,869	..	..	..	2,980	..	..	2,439	..	..	1,764	..	..	1,131	..	..	1,250
Tiruchirappalli	..	..	..	3,479	726	..	..	..	6,173	..	..	2,710	..	..	1,875	..	..	925	..	..	520
West Godavari	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	179	..	..	143	..	..	248	..	..	89	..	..	..
Kurnool	190	..	119	378	282	..	247	253	1,284	..	..	809	..	..	564	..	..	280	..	..	..
Ramanathapuram.	..	..	..	4,341	692	..	..	..	4,109	..	..	2,010	..	..	1,437	..	..	952	..	..	542
Chingleput	13	..	..	8,779	1,025	..	..	..	3,082	..	..	2,961	..	..	2,333	..	..	1,105	..	..	1,368
Tirunelveli	..	..	..	3,723	3,051	..	..	..	3.720	..	..	1,713	..	..	1,666	..	..	1,045	..	..	600
Salem	..	..	..	3,873	847	..	..	..	4,286	..	..	2,321	..	..	1,613	..	..	692	..	..	..
Coimbatore	..	..	..	2,553	5,607	..	..	..	2,246	..	..	1,069	..	..	1,011	..	..	407	..	..	..
Srikakulam	..	..	..	1,643	1,578	..	..	..	350	..	..	840	..	..	797	..	..	297	..	..	142
Madurai	..	..	..	2,229	113	..	..	..	2,731	..	..	1,265	..	..	1,142	..	..	1,050	..	..	730
Nellore	..	..	..	2,872	2,291	..	..	..	1,685	..	..	1,450	..	..	1,061	..	..	354	..	..	399
Total ..	325	104	120	58,703	30,661	3	2,021	680	46,026	98	161	29,235	171	340	24,423	283	388	12,219	182	233	7,836

APPENDIX VIII.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 20 asked by Sri Pragada Kotaiah at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 31st July 1952, page 835 supra.]

Serial number and name and address of the industrial concern.	*Amount of loan disbursed.*
(1)	(2)
1 Messrs. The Tuticorin Spinning Mills, Limited, Post Box No. 59, Tuticorin.	Rs. 5,00,000 (rupees five lakhs only).
2 Messrs. The Kasturi Engineers, Limited, Post Box No. 231, Syrian Church Road, Coimbatore.	Rs. 50,000 (rupees fifty thousand only).
3 Messrs. Vummidiars (Manufacturers), Limitd, No. 62/63, Govindappa Naick Street, Madras-1.	Rs. 1,85,000 (rupees one lakh and eighty-five thousand only).
4 Sri P. A. C. Ramaswamy Raja, "Rama Mandiram", Rajapalayam	Rs. 1,25,000 (rupees one lakh and twenty five thousand only).
5 Sri G. Changanlal, Proprietor, Damodhar Envelope Factory, No. 26, Thambu Chetty Street, Georgetown, Madras.	Rs. 50,000 (rupees fifty thousand only).
6 Messrs. The South India Carbonic Gas Industries, Limited, Tiruvottiyur High Road, Madras.	Rs. 1,00,000 (rupees one lakh only).
7 Sri B. F. Aranha, Proprietor, Messrs. B.F. Aranha and Company, Kankanady, Mangalore.	Rs. 7,720 (rupees seven thousand and seven hundred and twenty only).
8 Messrs. The Purnima Straw Board and Paper Mills, Limited, Moodabidri, South Kanara district.	Rs. 40,000 (rupees forty thousand only).
9 Messrs. The South Indian Silks, Limited, Gudiyatham, North Arcot district.	Rs. 60,000 (rupees sixty thousand only).

வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

APPENDIX VI

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 29 asked by Sri Prasada [illegible] at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held [illegible] July 1952, page 583 supra.]

Serial number and name	The address of the industrial concern. (1)	Amount of loan sanctioned. (2)
1	Messrs. The Tuticorin Spinning Mills, Limited, Post Box No. 39, Tuticorin.	Rs. 5,00,000 (rupees five lakhs only).
2	Messrs. The Kasturi [illegible] Box No. 221, Syrian [illegible] sons.	[illegible] (rupees [illegible] only).
3	Messrs. Vummidies (Madras) [illegible] No. [illegible] Naicken [illegible] Madras-1.	[illegible] (rupees [illegible]).
4	Sri [illegible] Hay[illegible] [illegible]	Rs. 1,[illegible] (rupees [illegible] lakh [illegible]).
5	Sri G. [illegible] Proprietor [illegible] Develop[illegible] No. [illegible] Street, [illegible] Madras.	Rs. [illegible]
6	Messrs. [illegible] [illegible] Road, Madras.	Rs. 1,00,000 (rupees one lakh only).
7	Sri B. K. [illegible] Proprietor [illegible] T.V. [illegible] and Company [illegible]	Rs. 7,120 (rupees seven thousand one hundred and twenty only).
8	Messrs. The [illegible] Paper Mills, [illegible] Kanara district.	Rs. 40,000 (rupees forty thousand only).
9	Messrs. The [illegible] Mills, [illegible] North Arcot district.	Rs. 60,000 (rupees sixty thousand only).

INDEX TO MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

SECOND SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.

Volume IV (Nos. 1 to 8).

23rd to 26th and 28th to 31st July 1952.

PAGES

A

Aboriginals—
Question *re* — of Kannavam forest area 724–726

Adikesavalu Naidu, Sri K.—
See Questions and Answers.

Adityan, Sri S. T.—
Bills—Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 782
Demand for Grant *re* Co-operation 563
See Questions and Answers.

Adjournment motion *re*—
Hunger-strike by political prisoners in Cannanore Jail 123–124
Place names in Hindi, erasure of — from the name boards in railway stations in Tamil Nad 733, 737

Administration of Justice—
Demand for Grant *re* — 589

Agricultural loans—
Question *re* extension of period of repayment of— 493–494

Agriculture—
Demand for Grant *re* 563–588

Aiyanar, Sri—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 140–142

" Ambi's Cafe "—
See " Trade disputes ".

Anandan, Sri L.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 163

Anantha Pai, Sri T.—
Demand for Grant *re* General Sales Tax and other Taxes and Duties 482–484
See Questions and Answers.

Anthony Pillai, Sri S. C. C.—
Bills—
Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 807, 808
Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 774, 784, 785

Demand for Grant *re*—
Co-operation 537
Labour including factories 387–392

Motion *re*—
Madras City Municipal Act, 1919, amendment to Schedule IV to the— 758
Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939, notification under section 3 (1) of the—approval of — 749, 750

PAGES

-A—*cont.*

Anti-Hindi agitation—
Adjournment motion *re* erasure of place names in Hindi from the name boards in railway stations in Tamil Nad 736, 737

Anti-pest chemicals—
Question *re* distribution of — to ryots 719–720

Antony Peter, Sri—
Demand for Grant *re* Agriculture 573–575

Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952—
See Bills.

Appu, Sri A.—
Demand for Grant *re* Land Revenue 275–276
See Questions and Answers.

Ardhanareeswara Gounder, Sri K. S.—
Demand for Grant *re* Electricity 203–205

Arumugam, Sri S.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 166–167

Arumugam, Sri V.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 155–156

Arumugham, Sri R. S.—
Demand for Grant *re* Land Revenue 302–304

Audinarayana Reddi, Sri Y. S.—
See Questions and Answers.

Audit fees—
Question *re* collection of — from mutts and temples 373

Ayurvedic preparations—
See Prohibition—

Ayyaru, Sri A.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 167–168

B

Badinegadda project—
See Irrigation 618

Balakrishnan, Sri V.—
Bills—Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 .. 794
Business of the House, programme of — 80–81
Condolence resolution *re* death of Sri V. Durgaprasad Veerabhadra Deo Bahadur, Raja of Kuruppam 698
Demand for Grant *re* Land Revenue 279–281
Speaker, Mr., announcement of the arrival of — 225
See Questions and Answers.

Balarama Reddi, Sri A.—
Demand for Grant *re* Labour including factories 396–398

Banjar lands—
Question *re* pattas for — in Anantapur district 709–710

Bapaiah Chowdary, Sri M.—
See Questions and Answers.

Bapanayya, Sri G.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 158–159

Bapanna Dora, Sri K.—
Demand for Grant *re* Land Revenue 277–278

Bapu Naidu, Sri P.—
Demand for Grant *re* —
Co-operation— 559, 560
Electricity 249–250
Forest 40–41

Basic Educational institutions—
Question *re* instructions imparted in— 731–732

PAGES

B—*cont.*

Bharathapuzha—
Question *re* bridge on—, construction of 603–604

Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952—
See 'Bills'.

Bills—
Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952—
Message from the Governor *re* — 620
Taken into consideration 621–693
Passed into law 693
Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952.—
Message from the Governor *re* — 621
Referred to Select Committee 850–852
Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill, 1952 —
Referred to Select Committee 853, 854
Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952—
Referred to Select Committee 791–820
Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952—
Referred to Select Committee 820–849
Madras Repealing and Amending Bill, 1952—
Not moved 854
Payment of Salaries and Removal of Disqualifications (Amendment) Bill, 1952—
Message from the Governor *re* — 621
Taken into consideration 763, 764
Passed into law 764
Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952—
Message from the Governor *re*— 621
Introduced 763
Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952—
Referred to Select Committee 764–791

Blood banks—
Question *re* particulars of — attached to Headquarters and Maternity hospitals 735–736

Board of Revenue—
Question *re* abolition of— 7–9

Bomman, Sri K. H.—
Demand for Grant *re* Forest 32–33

Brahadambal High School, Pudukkottai—
Question *re* management of— 713–714

Bridge—
Question *re* —
Construction of — at Boyallachiruvilla on the Nellore—Bombay Road 603
Construction of a — at Chetwai, Ponnani taluk 4

Buckingham and Carnatic Mills—
Question *re* stationing of a police force in — 370–371

Business of the House—
Motion under rule 24 for transaction of Government business on a non-official day 738
Programme of— 80–81 854, 855

C

Cannanore Jail—
Question *re* hunger-strike by Communist convicts in— 486–487

Capital Outlay on Civil Works—
Demand for Grant *re* — 591

Capital Outlay on Electricity Schemes—
Demand for Grant *re* — 591

Capital Outlay on Industrial Development—
Demand for Grant *re* — 590

Capital Outlay on Irrigation—
Demand for Grant *re* — 590

PAGES

C—*cont.*

Capital Outlay on Road Transport Schemes—
Demand for Grant *re* — 591

Capital Outlay on Schemes of State Trading—
Demand for Grant *re* — 591

Capital punishments—
Question *re* Number of execution carried out in 1951 708–709

Cattle—
Question *re* mortality of — in Chittoor district 617

Chadayan, Sri M.—
See Questions and Answers

Chidanandam, Sri V.—
Bills—Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 783, 784
Demand for Grant *re* Electricity 250

Chinna Ramanna, Sri—
Question *re* petition from — *re*-lands taken away from him 508

Chinnasami Naidu, Sri S.—
Demand for Grant *re* Forest 31–32

Chinnathambi Thevar, Sri M.—
Demand for Grant *re* General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties. 511, 512

Chockalingam, Sri P.—
Demand for Grant *re* Land Revenue 286–289

Cholera—
Question *re* Incidence of—in Royachoti taluk 619–620

Cinchona and Fisheries—
Demand for Grant *re* — 589

Civil Works—Establishment and Tools and Plant—
Demand for Grant *re* — 589

Civil Works—Grants-in-Aid—
Demand for Grant *re* — 589

Civil Works—Works—
Demand for Grant *re* — 589

Cold storage plants—
Question *re* erection of—in Andhra area, proposals for — 2–4

College (s)—
Question *re* second grade—for Bhadrachalam, starting of — .. 367

Committee—
Rules Committee, appointment of — 753, 754

Communists—
Question *re* hunger-strike in Cannanore Jail by — 486–187

Commuted Value of Pensions—
Demand for Grant *re* — 591

Condolence resolution *re* —
Durgaprasad Veera bhadra Deo Bahadur, Sri V., Raja of Kuruppam, death of— 697–699

Co-operation—
Demand for Grant *re* — 533–563

Co-operative department—
Question *re* Joint Registrars in — number of — 733–734

Co-operative societies—
Question *re* liquidation costs, collection from — 117

Copyists—
Question *re*—
— in the Judicial department— 501
—in the Revenue department.. 722

PAGES

D

Dairy farms—
Question *re* subsidy to owners of — grant of — 734
Dam—
Question *re* construction of a — across Maharajasamudram river.. 611
Dasarathan, Sri D.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 83–86
Deivasigamani, Sri S.—
Demand for Grant *re* Jails 462–463
Demand for Grants *re*—
Administration of Justice 589
Agriculture 563–588
Capital Outlay on Civil Works 591
Do. Electricity Schemes 591
Do. Industrial Development 590
Do. Irrigation 590
Do. Road Transport Schemes 591
Do. Schemes of State Trading 591
Cinchona and Fisheries 589
Civil Works—Establishment and Tools and Plant 589
Civil Works—Grants-in-aid 589
Civil Works—Works 589
Commuted Value of pensions 591
Co-operation 533–563
Electricity 187–191, 193–222, 247–269
Forest 15–47
General Sales Tax and other Taxes and Duties .. 469–484, 510–533
Harijan Uplift 48–79, 81–97, 124–187
Jails 433–469
Labour including factories 377–433
Land Revenue 269–324
Loans and Advances by the State Government 591
Miscellaneous 590
Motor Vehicles Acts 588
Payments of compensation to landholders on the abolition of the zamindari system 590
Pensions 589
Registration 588
Road Transport Schemes—Working Expenses 590
Stamps 588
State Legislature 324–349
Stationery and Printing 590
Veterinary 589

Demands for Grants—
Motion *re*—
Change in the order of voting on 377

Dharmalingam, Sri M.—
Bills—Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 663–665
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 138–140

Dispensaries—
Question *re*—
Rural — in the State, details *re* 112–113
Shop Assistants Act, application of 500

District Board (Guntur)—
Question *re* unsatisfactory working of — 6–7

District Board (Tiruchirappalli)—
Question *re*—
Nomination to — from Pudukkottai 115, 116–118
Sanction of advances to 232–233

Division List—
Rectification of errors in — 191–193

Durgaprasad Veerabhadra Deo Bahadur, Sri V., Raja of Kuruppam—
Condolence resolution on the death of 697–699

PAGES

E

Elaya Pillai, Sri V. T.—
Bills—Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 648–651
See Questions and Answers.

Elections—
Question *re*—
Allowances to staff employed on — 487–488
Propaganda by Ministers during official tours 361–363

Electricity—
Demand for Grant *re*— 187–191
193–222, 247–269
Question *re* supply of — to South Kanara district 372

Electricity Department—
Question *re* operative subordinates of the — representation from .. 495–496

Elumalai, Sri T. P.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 145–146

Engineering Colleges—
Question *re* admission to — 502–505

Essences—
See Prohibition.

Estates—
Question *re*—
Chintalapadu Vanthu estate, survey of — 711–712
Munagala estate, survey of — 708
Paritala Jagir villages, rates of rent in — 240–241
Venkatagiri estate, collection of grain rent in — 618
—in Tanjore district, taking over of — 732–733

Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill, 1952—
See " Bills ".

Evictions—
Question *re* Suits for — in South Kanara 720–721

F

Factory Inspectors—
Question *re* number of — in the State 723–724

Fair Price Shops—
Question *re* rations supplied in — in Coondapoor taluk 502

Famine—
Half-hour debate *re* starvation deaths in Chittoor and Anantapur districts (not allowed) 376–377
Question *re* do. do. 359–360
Question *re*—
Gruel Centres in Palnad area 247
Gruel Centres in Chittoor district 485–486
Orphanages, opening of, for destitute children in famine areas .. 606
Relief measures in Chittoor district 611
Relief measures in Penukonda and Kadiri taluks 368
Relief measures in Tirumayam and Kolathur taluks 500

Field Labour Co-operative Society, Mulakallanka—
See " Lands "

Finance Commission—
Question *re* representation to — by Madras Government 105–107

Fish—
See " Sales Tax ".
See " Statistics ".

Five-year Plan—
Question *re* irrigation schemes included in— 701–703

PAGES

F—*cont.*

Foodgrains—
Question *re*—
Ordinance to control dealings in— 593
Central Government's orders *re*— 595–597
Paddy, village-site price of, in Tanjore and Tiruchirappalli .. 246–247

Food Production Committees—
Question *re* abolition of— 242–243

Forest—
Demand for Grant *re* 15–47

G

Gajapathi Raju, Sri P. V. R.—
See Questions and Answers.

Gangappa, Sri M.—
Demand for Grant *re* General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties 514, 515

Gangayya Naidu, Sri B.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 156–158

General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties—
Demand for Grant *re* 469–484
510–533

"Ghiriyar Project"—
Question *re* investigation, etc., of— 107–108

Gopala Gounder, Sri V.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 87–89
See Questions and Answers.

Gopalakrishnaiah, Sri Vavilala—
Bills—
Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 624, 625, 654, 655
Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 838–840
Demand for Grant *re*—
Agriculture 571–573
Electricity 262–263
Land Revenue 320

Gopalakrishnan, Sri P. K.—
Demand for Grant *re* Electricity 247–249
See Questions and Answers.

Gopala Menon, Sri N.—
Bills—Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 840–841
Motion *re* Madras City Municipal Act, 1919, amendment to Schedule IV to the 758–759

Gopalan, Sri K. P.—
Demand for Grant *re* Labour including Factories 380–385
432–433
See Questions and Answers.

Gopalan Unni, Sri K. C.—
Bills—Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 .. 810
Demand for Grant *re*—
Forest 22–23
General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties 476–477

Govindan, Sri G.—
Demand for Grant *re* General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties. 477–478

Govinda Rao, Sri K.—
Demand for Grant *re* Land Revenue 295–297,
320
See Questions and Answers.

PAGES

G—*cont.*

Govindasamy Nayagar, Sri A.—
Bills—Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 779, 780
Grain dealers—
Question *re* licence for— 593–595
"Grow More Food" Campaign—
Question *re* expenditure on—in 1940–1952 13–14
Gruel Centres—
See "Famine."
Gunriah, Sri P.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 86–87

H

Half-hour Debate *re* starvation deaths in Chittoor and Anantapur districts (not allowed). 376–377
Handloom Industry—
Question *re*—
Handloom factories in Malabar, allotment of yarn to— 244
Handloom weavers of Malabar, unemployment among— 355
Hanumantha Rao, Sri M.—
Bills—Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 832–834
See Questions and Answers.
Harijans—
Question *re*—
Grant of house-sites to— 14, 492, 615–616
Grant of lands to— 492, 730
Grant of well subsidies to 731
Harijan Uplift—
Demand for Grant *re*— 48–79, 81–97, 124–187
Hindi place-names in railway stations—
See "Anti-Hindi agitation."
Hosdrug sub-taluk—
Question *re* inclusion of—in Malabar zone 114
Hospital (s)—
Question *re*—
Application of Shop Assistants' Act to—and dispensaries 500
Badagara Headquarters Hospital, shifting of— 710
King George Hospital, Visakhapatnam, bed strength in— .. 608
King George Hospital, private practice of doctors working in— .. 120–121
Tiruchirappalli Headquarters Hospital, working of— 604–605
Tirupathi Government Hospital, increase of accommodation in— 607
Veterinary Hospital for Munagala Parganas, opening of a .. 111–112
See "Blood Banks".
House rent allowance—
Question *re* payment of— to menial staff of municipalities 494
Hunger-strike—
Adjournment motion *re*—by political prisoners in Cannanore Jail .. 123–124
Question *re*—by Communist convicts in Cannanore Jail 486–487
Indrayya, Sri C. H.—
See Questions and Answers.

I

Industrial development—
Question *re* expenditure incurred on account of— 726
Iron and steel—
Question *re* supply of—for agricultural purposes 727–728
Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952—
See 'Bills'.
Irrigation projects—
Question *re*—
Badinegadda (Pullampet) Project 618
—in Tiruchirappalli district 609
—included in the Five-year Plan 701–703

PAGES

I—*cont.*

Ishwara, Sri K.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan uplift 135–136

J

Jagannathan, Sri M —
Demand for Frant *re* Labour including factories 405–406

Jail (s)—
Adjournment motion and question *re* Cannanore Jail, hunger-strike of Communist prisoners in 123–124, 486–487.
Demand for grant *re* — 433–469
Question *re* —
Salem Central Jail, representation from prisoners in 373–375
Salem Central Jail, shooting incident in, report of the committee of enquiry into— 719
Under-trial prisoners of Chirakkal taluk, death of 496–500

Jayarama Reddiar, Sri S.—
Bills—Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 837
Demand for Grant *re* General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties. 516, 517

Jeevanandam, Sri P.—
Demand for Grant *re* Labour including factories 398–401
See Questions and Answers.

Joseph, Sri G.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 149–151

Journals and Presses —
Question *re* list of — from which securites was demanded . .. 729

Judiciary—
Question *re* separation of — from executive in Malabar district .. 601–603

K

Kalyanasundaram, Sri M.—
Demand for Grand *re* Jails 439–441
See Questions and Answers.

Kanaran, Sri C. H.—
Demand for Grant *re* Labour including factories 415–416
See Questions and Answers.

Kandasami, Sri C.—
Bills—Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 834–836
Demand for Grant *re* Land Revenue 271–274, 323

Karuthiruman, Sri P. G.—
Bills—Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952.. 639–641
Demand for Grant *re*—Electricity 210–211

Kattimuthu, Sri—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan uplift 70–73

Kolkebail, Sri S. S. —
Demand for Grant *re* Electricity 193–195
Motion *re* Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939, notification under section 3 (1) of the— 741, 742
See Questions and Answers.

Kondayya, Sri G. C.—
Demand for Grant *re*
Harijan Uplift,— 147–148
Labour including factories 414–415
See Questions and Answers.

" Koppam Pattambi Road "—
See "Roads."

K—*cont.*

PAGES

Koran, Sri O.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan uplift 78–79

Kosalram, Sri K. T.—
Bills—
Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 674–676
Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 780–782
Demand for Grant *re* Electricity 195–197
See Questions and Answers.

Kotaiah, Sri Pragada—
Demand for Grant *re* Co-operation 547–550
See Questions and Answers.

Kothapalem—
Question *re* assessment of silted-up lands in — 506

Koti Reddi, Sri K.—
Bills—Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution,) Bill, 1952 .. 808–810

Krishna Ayyar, Sri V. R.—
Bill—Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 626–629
See Questions and Answers.

Krishnamurthy Goundar, Sri D.—
Demand for Grant *re* Land Revenue 293–295

Krishnan, Sri R.—
Bills—Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 845, 846
Demand for Grant *re*—Land Revenue 301–302
See Questions and Answers.

Krishna Rao, Sri K.—
Bills—Stage Crrriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 778
Demand for Grant *re*—
Co-operation 542–547
Jails 457–459
See Questions and Answers.

Krishna Rao, Sri Y. V —
See Questions and Answers.

Krishna Rao, the Hon. Dr. M. V.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan uplift 48–52, 178–184

Krishna Rao, the Hon. Dr. U.—
Bills—Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 786–790
Demand for Grant *re* Labour including factories 377–380, 397, 424–432

Krishnaswami, Sri Venugopala—
Demand for Grant *re* Electricity 250–252

Krishnaswami Naidu, Sri R.—
Demand for Grant *re* General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties. 479–481

Kune Rao, Sri M.
Demand for Grant *re* Forest 33–35

Kunban, Sri E. T.—
Demand for rGant *re* Harijan Uplift 148–149

Kunhirama Kidav, Sri P.—
Bills—land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 844, 845
See Questions and Answers.

Kunhirma Kurup, Sri C.—
Demand for Grant *re* Electricity 221–22

Kuppuswami, Sri R.—
Demand for Grant *re* Labour including factories 385–387

PAGES

K—*cont.*

Kuttikrishnan Nayar, the Hon. Sri K. P.—
Bills—Repealing and Amending Bill, 1952—Not moved 854
Demand for Grant *re* Jails. 433–438, 465–468

Kuttipuram Bridge—
Question *re* — 490, 603-604

L

Labour including Factories—
Demand for Grant *re* 377–433

Lakshmana Das, Sri L.—
Demand for Grant *re* Land Revenue 297–299
See Questions and Answers.

Lakshmanaswami, Sri M.—
Bills—Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 .. 811, 812

Lakshminarasa Raju, Sri B.—
Bills—Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 .. 805, 806

Lakshminarayana Reddi, Sri T.—
Bill—Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 672–674
Demand for grant *re* Forest 39–40
See Questions and Answers.

Lakshmipathy Naicker, Sri K. S.—
Demand for grant *re*—
Agriculture 581, 582
Forest 29

Lands—
Question *re*—
Assignment of — to political sufferers, complaints *re*— 363–364, 508, 704–705
Assignment of — in Allur-Nizampatam, Guntur district 1–2
Assignment of — to Sri Kallur Subba Rao, complaints *re*— .. 375
Government waste lands, grant of pattas to Harijans for— .. 731
Government waste lands in Bapatla village, complaints *re* leasing of— 365–366
Government waste lands in Kaikalur taluk reserved for ex-toddy tappers but granted to political sufferers 616–617
Government waste lands in Narsapur taluk, grant of pattas, levy of penalties for unauthorised cultivation, etc. 611–615
Government waste lands on the sides of Romperu Drainage canal, complaints *re* allotment of, to political sufferers 501
Lanka lands assigned to Field Labour Co-operative Society, Government waste lands, penalty for unauthorized cultivation of— 712–730
Mulakallanka 369–370

Land Revenue—
Demand for Grant *re* 269–324
Question *re*—
Collection of — in Zamindari villages of Udayagiri taluk .. 121–122
Revision of assessment in Pattukottai and Arantangi taluks .. 228–230

Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952—
See 'Bills'.

Latchanna, Sri G.—
Bills—
Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 799–801
Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 845
Demand for Grant *re*—
Land Revenue 307–311
State Legislature 332–334
See Questions and Answers.

Legal Aid—
Question *re* grant of — to poor litigants in Malabar 601–603

PAGES

L—*cont.*

Legislature—
See State Legislature.

Lignite deposits—
Question *re* Investigation of—in South Arcot district 728–729
Report of the Expert Committee and High Power Committee *re* — 716

L.I.M. and L.M.P. courses—
See Medical Education.

Livestock Farm—
Question *re* opening of — in Nandyal taluk 508–509

Loans—
Question *re*—
Grant of Taccavi loans and subsistence loans to agriculturists in Anantapur district 360–361
Grant of — under State Aid to Industries Act 735
Grant of — to Venkateswara Paper and Strawboard Mills .. 244–246

Loans and Advances by the State Government—
Demand for Grant *re* — 591

Local bodies—
Question *re* scales of pay of employees in — 599–600

M

Madanagopal, Sri V.—
Demand for Grant *re* General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties. 512–514

Madhavan Nambiar, Sri K.—
Demand for Grant *re* Jails 452–453
See Questions and Answers.

Madras City Municipal Act, 1919—
Motion *re* Amendment to Schedule IV to the — 754–762

Mahalingam, Sri N.—
Demand for Grant *re* Labour including factories 410–412
See Questions and Answers.

Malakondayya, Sri K.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 154–155

Malliah, Sri T—.
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 68–70

Manickam, Sri P. G.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 73–75
Jails 450–452

Manickasundaram, Sri M.—
Bill—Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 668, 669

Manickavelu Naicker, the Hon. Sri M. A.—
Bills—
Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952 .. 850, 852
Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill, 1952 .. 853
Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 791–793, 817–819
Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 820–821, 847–848, 849
Demand for Grant *re* Land Revenue 269–271, 319–323

Manjaya Shetty, Sri Y.—
See Questions and Answers.

Marimuthu, Sri M.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 148

PAGES

M—*cont.*

Medical College(s)—
Question *re*—
Admission to — 705–707
Opening of a — at Madanapalle — 597–598

Medical Education—
Question *re*—
L.I.M. course, abolition of — 118–120
L.M.P. course, revival of — 118–120

Menon, Dr. K. B.—
Bills — Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 777
Condolence resolution *re* — death of Sri V. Durgaprasad Veerabhadra Deo Bahadur, Raja of Kuruppam. 698
Demand for Grant *re* —Co-operation 537–542

Messages from the Governor *re*—
Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 620
Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952 .. 621
Payment of Salaries and Removal of Disqualifications (Amendment) Bill, 1952. 621
Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952 621

Minimum Wages—
See " Wages ".

Minister(s)—
Question *re*—
Chief Minister, salary drawn by — 230–231
Election propaganda by — during official tours — 361–363
Travelling allowance for Chief Minister for his tour in Coimbatore district. 505
Travelling allowance for Finance Minister for his tour in Aruppukkottai. 365

Miscellaneous—
Demand for Grant *re*— 590

Mogral, Janab M. S.—
See Questions and Answers.

Moidu, Janab K.—
Demand for Grant *re* —Electricity 255–256

Motor Vehicles Acts—
Demand for Grant *re* — 588

Motor Vehicles Tax—
Question *re* Revenue from — in Malabar district in 1951–52 .. 357

Motor Vehicles Taxation Act—
See ' Papers placed on the table of the House.'

Mounaguruswamy Naidu, Sri N.—
Demand for Grant *re* — General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties. 474–476

Municipalities—
Question *re* salaries and allowances of Public Health menials in — .. 122–123
494

Muni Reddi, Sri M.—
Demand for Grant *re*—
Agriculture 579–581
Labour including Factories 412–414
See Questions and Answers.

Munisami Pillay, Sri M. S.—
Demand for Grant *re* — Labour including Factories 401–402

Muniswami Gounder, Sri P. M.—
Demand for Grant *re* — General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties. 518–519

PAGES

M—*cont.*

Muthiah Chettiyar of Chettinad, Raja —
Bills—
Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 629–634
Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 797–799
Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 829–832
Demand for Grant *re*—
Electricity 252–253
State Legislature 328–332

Muthu, Sri V.—
Demand for Grant *re* — Harijan Uplift 89–92

Muthukumaraswami, Sri—
Demand for Grant *re* — Harijan Uplift 94–97

Muthuswamy, Sri A.—
Demand for Grant *re* — Land revenue 292–293

N

Nagan Gouda, the Hon. Dr. R.—
Demand for Grant *re*—
Agriculture 563–571
Forest 15–17
42–47

Nagarajan, Sri V. R.—
Demand for Grant *re* — Agriculture 575–578

Nageswara Rao, Sri G.—
Bills — Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 .. 815–816
Demand for Grant *re* — Harijan Uplift 132–135

Nagi Reddi, Sri T.—
Adjournment motion *re* — Hunger-strike by political prisoners in Cannanore Jail. 124

Bills—
Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 634–639
Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 794–797
818
Demand for Grant *re*—
Land Revenue 320
State Legislature 330, 331
Half hour debate *re* starvation deaths in Chittoor and Anantapur districts, request for— 376–377
Motion under rule 24 *re* — Business of the House 783
See Questions and Answers.

Nakkalagandi tank—
Question *re* Construction of 716

Nallasivam, Sri K. R.—
Bills, Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 841, 842

Nallaswami, Sri B. K.—
Demand for Grant *re* — Co-operation 550, 551
See Questions and Answers.

Nanjappa, Sri O. A.—
Demand for Grant *re* — Harijan Uplift 81–83

Narasa Raju, Sri B.—
See Questions and Answers.

Narasimha Reddi, Sri P.—
See Questions and Answers.

Narayana, Sri K.—
Demand for Grant *re* — Harijan Uplift 66–67

PAGES

N—*cont.*

Narayana Kurup, Sri M.—
Bills—
Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 677, 678
Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 849
Demand for Grant *re* — General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties 478
See Questions and Answers.

Narayana Nambiar, Sri M.—
Demand for Grant *re* — Land Revenue 306–307

Narayana Nambiar, Sri T. C.—
Adjournment motion *re*— Hunger-strike by political prisoners in Cannanore Jail 124
Bills—Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 778, 779
Demand for Grant *re* —Jails 463–465
See Questions and Answers.

Narayanappa, Sri S.—
See Questions and Answers.

Non-Gazetted Officers—
Question *re* Confidential reports about—abolition of 490–492

P

Paddy—
See ' Foodgrains '.

Padmaprabha Gounder, Sri—
Demand for Grant *re* —Electricity 200–201
See Questions and Answers.

Pakkirisami Pillai, Sri S.—
Demand for Grant *re*—
Harijan Uplift 153–154
Labour including Factories 408–410
See Questions and Answers.

Palaniandi, Sri M.—
Demand for Grant *re*—
Harijan Uplift 163–164
Labour including Factories 402–405

Palaniappan, Sri R. M.—
See Questions and Answers.

Palanimuthu, Sri M.—
Demand for Grant *re* —Electricity 253–254

Palanisami, Sri N. K.—
See Questions and Answers.

Palanisami Gounder, the Hon. Sri V. C.—
Bills—Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952—Introduced 763

Panchayat Boards—
Question *re* Functioning of—as village courts 243

Panchayat Board (Salur)—
Question *re* Conversion of—into a municipality 9–10

Panchayat Board (Udangudi)—
Question *re* Administration of 717–718

Papers placed on the table of the House—
Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, exemptions from—(G.Os. No. 2095, dated 11th June 1952 and No. 2293, dated 26th June 1952.) 484
Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, amendment to notification under—
(G.O. No. 1868, dated 26th May 1952) 484
Sivakasi Municipal Electrical Undertaking, acquisition by Government—[G.O. Ms. No. 2374, P.W. (Electricity), dated 2nd June 1952] 855

P—*cont.*

Paramasiva Udayar, Sri N.—
Bills—Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 671, 672
Pattabhi Rama Rao, the Hon. Sri S. B. P.—
Demand for Grant *re* —General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties 469–470, 525–533
Motion *re* —Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939—Notification under section 3 (1) of 738, 739
Payments of compensation to Landholders on the abolition of the Zamindari System—Demand for Grant *re* — 590
Payment of Salaries and Removal of Disqualifications (Amendment) Bill, 1952—
See 'Bills'.
Pensions—
Demand for Grant *re* — 589
Police—
Question *re* —
Constables, quarters for— 489–490
Constables, salary and allowances of— 607–608, 719–711, 721
Inspector of Police, Visakhapatnam, instructions to, regarding people approaching Communist Legislators 368–369
Manjeri Police Station, detection of crimes in the jurisdiction of— 225–228
Police officers of coastal Andhra districts, Conference of— .. 230
Pudukkottai State Police, absorption of, in Madras State Service 720
Special Armed Police, stationing of—
in Jaggayapet 703–704
in Kanur, etc., villages 238–240
in Tanjore district 234–235
in West Godavari district 237–238
Political prisoners—
Adjournment motion *re* hunger-strike by—in Cannanore Jail .. 123–124
Political sufferers—
Question *re* assignment of lands to— 363–364, 508, 704–705
Poll—
See 'Division List'.
Presses—
Question *re* demand of securities from— 729
Preventive Detention Act—
Question *re* Correspondence with the Union Government *re* — .. 598–599
Prisoners—
See 'Jails'.
Producer-cum-Consumer-Co-operative Societies—
Question *re* Amount collected by—in Malabar district 495
Prohibition—
Question *re*—
Arrack, unauthorized sale in Srikakulam 376
Ayurvedic preparations, restrictions on— 120, 367–368, 714–715
Convictions under the Prohibition Act— 609
Essences (banana, pine-apple, etc)., sale of— 714–715
Loss due to— 730
Nira (sweet toddy), tapping of— 369, 507
Number of unemployed in South Kanara due to— 4–6

PAGE

P—*cont.*

Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952.—
See ' Bills '.

Public Service Commission Examinations—
Question *re* number of candidates from Andhra districts for the June 1952 Examination— 375–376

Pudukkottai State—
Question *re*—
Assets and liabilities of—at the time of merger 71
Police personnel of—absorption of, in Madras State Service .. 720

Pudukudi Tank—
Question *re.* restoration of the— 367

Pullampet Project—
See Irrigation Projects.

Pulla Reddi, Sri C.—
Bills—Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 .. 803–805
Demand for Grant *re*—Electricity 254–255

Pumpsets—
Question *re* number of—in Udayarpalayam taluk 716–717

Pundarikakshacharyulu, Sri P.—
Demand for Grant *re.*—Land Revenue 284–286
See Questions and Answers.

Q

Questions and Answers—
Adikesavalu Naidu, Sri K.—
Question *re*—
Government Hospital, Tirupathi — increase in accommodation. 607
Venkateswara Paper and Straw-board Mills, Tirupati, amount of loan advanced to 244–246

Adityan, Sri S. T.—
Question *re* travelling allowance for the Finance Minister for tour in Aruppukottai 365

Anantha Pai, Sri T.—
Question *re*—
Audit fees, Collection of, from mutts and temples 373
Ayurvedic preparations — restrictions on tincture, etc. .. 715
L M.P. Course — proposals for revival of — 118–12
Shop Assistants Act — cost of implementation of — 356

Appu, Sri A.—
Question *re*—
Bharatapuzha, construction of a bridge across— 603–604
Dairy farms, grant of subsidy to owners of— 734

Audinarayana Reddi, Sri Y.—
Question *re* Cholera in Royachoti taluk 619–620

Balakrishna, Sri V.—
Question *re*—
Brahadambal High School, Pudukkottai, management of — .. 713–714
Co-operative Department, number of Joint Registrars in — .. 733–734
Co-operative Societies, collection of liquidation costs from — .. 117
Estates in Tanjore district, taking over of — 732–733
Factory Inspectors in the State, number of — 723–724
Maharajasamudram river, construction of dam across — .. 611
Police personnel of Pudukkottai State — absorption in Madras State Service 720
Pudukottai State-assets and liabilities at the time of merger. 13
Tuberculosis Hospital of Pudukkottai, construction of a — .. 507

Bapaiah Chowdary, Sri M.—
Question *re*—
Gruel centres in Palnad area, number of— 247

Chadayan, Sri M.—
Question *re*—
Harijans — grant of lands to— 492

PAGE

Q—*cont.*

Questions and Answers—*cont.*

Gajapathi Raju, Sri P. V. R.—
Question *re*—
Cold storage plants, proposals for erection of — in Andhra area .. 2–4
Fish catches, collection of statistics *re* 114–115

Gopala Gounder Sri V.—
Question *re*.Prohibition — loss due to introduction of — 730

Gopalakrishnan, Sri P. K —
Question *re*—
Bridge construction at Chetivai, Ponnani taluk 4
Producer-*cum*-Consumer Societies, amount collected by, in Malabar 495
Public Health menials, salaries, etc., of — 122–123

Gopalan, Sri K. P —
Question *re*—
Cannanore Jail, hunger-strike by Communist prisoners in— .. 486–487
Municipal employees, minimum wages, house allowance, etc. of — 353–355 494,
Police constables, salary and allowances of— 710–711
Salem Jail, report of the enquiry into the firing in— 719
Yarn, basis of allotment to handloom factories in Malabar .. 244

Govinda Rao, Sri K.—
Question *re*—Sugarcane, payment of cost by factories in instalments 11–13

Hanumantha Rao, Sri M.—
Question *re*:—District Board, Guntur, unsatisfactory working of — 6–7
Prisoners in Salem Jail — Representations from — 373–375

Indrayya. Sri C. H.—
Question *re*.—Sugarcane prices, reduction of — representation from ryots against,— 114

Jeevanandam, Sri P.—
Question *re*—Buckingham and Carnatic Mills, stationing of Police force in — 370–371

Kalyanasundaram, Sri M.—
Question *re*—
Journals and presses, demand of security from — 729
Political sufferers in Tiruchirappalli, assignment of lands to— .. 363–364

Kanaran, Sri C. H.—
Question *re*—Sales Tax on fish, levy of, in West Coast 364–365

Kolkebail, Sri S. S.—
Question *re*—
Chief Minister's Salary 230–231
Copyists in the Revenue Department—payment of allowances to — 722
Prohibition in South Kanara, number of unemployed on account of — 4–6

Kondayya Sri G. C.—
Question *re*—
Bridge at Boyallachiruvilla on the Nellore — Bombay road, construction of— 603
Relief works in Chittoor district 611

Kosalram, Sri K. T.—
Question *re*—
Ghiriyar Project, Investigation of — 107–108
Shenbagavalli Dam—Execution of — 111
Udangudi Panchayat Board—administration of — 717–718

PAGES

Q—*cont.*

Questions and Answers—*cont.*
Kotaiah, Sri Pragada—
Question *re*—
Madras State Aid to Industries Act — Loans granted under— .. 735
Romperu Drainage Canal bank lands — allotment of — 501
Waste lands in Bapatla taluk, leasing of — 365–366

Krishna Ayyar, Sri V. R.—
Question *re*—
Aboriginals in Kannavam forest area 724–7
Anti-pest chemicals—distributions to ryots 719–720
Capital punishment — number of executions carried out in 1951 708–709
Jaggery manufacture by Co-operatives in Malabar — permission to tap "Nira" 369
Judiciary and Executive—Separation in Malabar 601–603
Motor Vehicles Tax, revenue in 1951–52 from Malabar, amount of— 357
Prohibition Act—convictions under— 609
Sea water, use for agricultural purposes, research on— 707–708
Travelling allowance paid to teachers on election work 488

Krishnan, Sri R.—
Question *re*—
Ayurvedic medicines—duty on banana and pineapple essences .. 714–715
Foodgrains, Central Government's orders *re* 595–597
Handloom weavers of Malabar—representation from — .. 355

Krishna Rao, Sri K.—
Question *re*—
Blood banks attached to Headquarters and Maternity hospitals 735–736
Copyists in Judicial Department 501
Grain rents — collection in Venkatagiri estate 618
Kothapalam village, silt clearance in wet lands in — 506
Lignite deposits in South Arcot, investigation of — 728–729
Nellore to Kanigiri railway line, construction of — 610
Police constables—daily batta for railway journeys 721
Policemen, provision of quarters for — 489–490
Police officers of Coastal Andhra Districts, Conference of — .. 225–228
Preventive Detention Act—State Government's views on — .. 598–599
Rayalaseema Development Board—Nominations to — 508

Krishna Rao, Sri Y. V.—
Question *re*—
Second Grade College for Bhadrachalams—Starting of a— .. 367

Kunhirama Kidav, Sri P.—
Question *re*—
Kuttipuram Bridge — progress of work on — 490

Lakshmana Das, Sri L.—
Question *re*—
Village officers, travelling allowance for attending taluk headquarters 236–237

Lakshminarasa Raju, Sri B.—
Question *re*—
Agricultural loans—Extension of period of repayment 493–494
Waste lands in Narasapur taluk —cultivation of — 611–615

Lakshminarayana Reddi, Sri T.—
Question *re*—
Famine relief works in Penukonda and Kadiri taluks—Details *re*— 368

Latchanna, Sri G.—
Question *re*—
Five-year plan, irrigation schemes included in— 701–703

Madhavan Nambiar, Sri K.—
Question *re*—
Salem Jail firing—Enquiry committee report, publication of — 719

PAGES

Q—*cont.*

Questions and Answers.—*cont.*

Mahalingam, Sri N.—
Question *re*—
Coal, extraction of, from Neyveli area 716

Manjaya Shetty, Sri Y.—
Question *re*—
Electric power for South Kanara district, supply of — 372
Evictions, number of suits filed in South Kanara 720–721
Fair price shops in Coondapur taluk 502
Nira parlours in South Kanara district, opening of — 507

Menon, Dr. K. B.—
Question *re*—
Poramboke lands, penalty for cultivation of, by landless labourers 712–713

Mogral, Janab M. S.—
Question *re*—
Hosdrug Sub-taluk, inclusion of, in Malabar zone 114

Muni Reddi, Sri M.—
Question *re*—
Well Subsidy Scheme, details *re* expenditure, etc., on — .. 357–359

Nagi Reddi, Sri T.
Question *re*—
Banjar lands in Anantapur district, grant of pattas for — .. 709–710
Chinna Ramanna, Sri—representation *re* land taken away from — 508
Lands in Kanchi Samudram village, petition *re* assignment of— 375
Orphanages—Opening of, in famine affected areas for destitute children 606
Travelling allowance drawn by Chief Minister for tour in Coimbatore district 505

Nallaswami, Sri B. K.—
Question *re* L.I.M. Course—Abolition of— 600–601

Narasimha Reddi, Sri P.—
Question *re*—
Badinegadda irrigation project—Execution of — 618
Rajampet Deputy Collector's Headquarters—Transfer of — .. 243

Narayana Kurup, Sri M.—
Question *re*—
Grow More Food Campaign,—details of expenditure in 1940–52 on— 13–14
Industrial development, expenditure incurred on account of— .. 726
Teachers in aided schools, revision of salary of — 241–242

Narayana Nambiar, Sri T. C.—
Question *re*—
Under-trial prisoners in Chirkkal taluk, death of — 496–500

Narayanappa, Sri S.—
Question *re*—
Local bodies—Pay of employees in — 599–600
Vigilance committees, constitution of — 506

Padmaprabha Gounder, Sri M. K.—
Question *re* Asavas and Arishtas, inclusion in the prohibition list.. 367–368

Pakkirisami Pillay, Sri S.—
Question *re* Ambi's Cafe, Madras, conciliation of dispute in — .. 231–232

Palaniappan, Sri R. M.—
Question *re*—
District Boards, nomination to, from Pudukkottai 115–116
Famine-relief measures taken in Thirumayam and Kolathur taluks 500

Palanisamy, Sri N. K.—
Question *re* policemen—reduction in daily batta for — 607–608

Questions and Answers—*cont.*

Pundarikakshacharyulu, Sri P.—
Question *re*—
Arrack, unauthorized sale in Srikakulam district — 376
Thummarada-Jamparakota road, construction of 605

Radhakrishnan, Sri S.—
Question *re* Vanamadevi and Thiruvendipuram dams in South Arcot, silt clearance from 605–606
Rajachidambaram, Sri P. B. K.—
Question *re*—
Headquarters hospital at Tiruchirappalli 604–605
Rural Dispensaries in the State, details *re* — 112–113
Rajagopalan, Sri N.—
Question *re* Tiruchirappalli District Board—Nomination to, from Pudukottai 118
Rajagopala Rao, Sri K.—
Question *re*—
Harijans of Jami Golivipalli village, house-sites for 615–616
House-sites—grants of, to Harijans 615–616
Veterinary College, Madras, number of students admitted in 1948–52 108–110
Rajeswara Rao, Sri M.—
Question *re*—
Government lands, grant of pattas to Harijans for — 730
Political sufferers, assignment of lands to— 704–705
Revenue and expenditure of the Madras Government, district-war particulars— 14–15
Revenues derived from West Godavari district 730
Shop Assistants Act, application to hospitals and dispensaries.. 500
Well subsidy scheme—Subsidy granted to Harijans and others 731
Ramachandra Rao, Sri P. S.—
Question *re* Special Armed Police in West Godavari district, stationing of — 237–238
Ramalingam, Sri S.—
Question *re* Madras Electricity Department Operative Subordinates Service Association's representation 495–496
Rama Rao, Sri G.—
Question *re*—
Board of Revenue, abolition of — 7–9
Election propaganda at Kakinada by Ministers — 361–363
Government waste lands in Kaikalur, reservation of, for ex-tappers 616–617
House-sites for Harijans granted during 1946–51 14
Non-Gazetted officers, confidential sheets *re*— 490–492
Rama Rao, Sri N. V.—
Question *re* Lanka lands given to Field Labour Co-operative Society, Mulakallanka, reasons for auctioning of — 369–370
Rama Rao, Sri V.—
Question *re* Rent rates in Paritala Jagir villages, Nandigama taluk— 240–241
Ramaswami, Sri C. Rajam—
Question *re* Iron and steel, supply for agricultural purposes .. 727–728
Ramaswamy Mudaliar, Sri V. K.—
Question *re* Advances to District Boards, sanction of — 232–233
Ramesam Sri K. V.—
Question *re*—
Ayurvedic medicines, exemption from Prohibition Act 120
Panchayat Boards, notification to make them function as village courts 243

PAGES

Q—*cont.*

Questions and Answers—*cont.*

Ramiah Chowdary, Sri K.—
Question *re*—
Land Revenue in Zamindari villages of Udayagiri, etc., collection of 121–122
Tamidapadu and Nakkalagandi tanks, construction of .. 716

Rangaswami Reddiar, Sri P.—
Question *re*—
Irrigation projects for Tiruchirappalli district 609
Paddy price (village-site) in Tanjore and Tiruchirappalli districts 246–247

Sankaranarayana Menon, Sri V.—
Question *re*—
Basic educational institutions—Instructions imparted in .. 731–732
Koppam-Penganttiri road, Walluvanad taluk, construction of — 121

Sankara Varma Raja, Sri E. K.—
Question *re*—
Food Production Committees, abolition of 242–240
Headquarters Hospital at Badagara, Shifting of.. 713

Satyanarayana, Sri G.—
Question *re* Special Armed Police at Kanur Agraharam Stationing of 238–240

Seetharamiah, Sri D.—
Question *re*—
Cattle mortality in Chittoor district 617
Deaths due to starvation in Chittoor and Anantapur districts 359–360
Gruel centres in Chittoor district 485–486
Medical College at Madanapalle, opening of a — 597–598

Seethi, Janab K. M.—
Question *re*—
Crimes within the jurisdication of Manjeri Police Station, detection of 230
Foodgrains, Ordinance to control dealings in 593

Sivarami Reddi, Sri N.—
Question *re* Election staff, payment of allowance to 487

Sri Krishna, Sri V.—
Question *re* Land assignment in Alur-Nizmpatnam, Guntur district. 1–2

Subba Reddi, Sri M.—
Question *re* Livestock Farm—Opening of, in Nandyal taluk .. 508–509

Swaminathan, Sri R. V.—
Question *re* Tenants—Eviction by landlords in Kumbakonam taluk 619

Swayamprakasam, Sri S.—
Question *re*—
Engineering Colleges—Admission to 502–505
Medical Colleges—Admission to 705–707

Veerabhadran, Sri M.—
Question *re*—
Inspector of Police, Visakhapatnam—Instructions to, *re* people approaching Communist legislators for help 368–369
King George Hospital, Visakhapatnam, Bed-strength in .. 608
Doctors working in, private practice by 120–121
Public Service Commission examination held in June 1952—Number of candidates from Andhra districts 375–376

Vema Reddy, Sri K. V.—
Question *re* Takkavi loans, applications from agriculturists in Anantapur district for 360–361

Q—*cont.*

Questions and Answers—*cont.*

Venkata Jagga Rao, Sri R.—
Question *re* Grain dealers—Licence for— 593–59

Venkatanarayana Dora, Sri K.—
Question *re*—
Panchayat Board, Salur, conversion into municipality 9–10
Salur-Bobbili Railway line, restoration of— 357

Venkatarama Iyer, Sri S.—
Question *re* Land revenue levy in abolished inam and zamin villages in Arantangi and Pattukottai taluks 228–230

Venkatasubbayya, Sri P.—
Question *re* Pullampet project—Execution of— 618

Venkatesa Sholagar, Sri P.—
Question *re* Special Armed Police in Tanjore district, stationing of— 234–235

Venkateswarlu, Sri Pillalamarri—
Question *re*—
Chinatalapadu Vanthu Estate—Survey of — 711–712
Munagala estate, survey of— 708
Special Armed Police stationed at Jaggayyapet 703–704
Veterinary Hospital for Munagala Pargana, proposals for opening a— 111–112

Viswanatham, Sri T.—
Question *re* Finance Commission, Representation by Madras Government to— 105–107

Viswanathan, Sri K. R.—
Question *re*—
Pudukudi tank, restoration of— 367
Pump sets in Udayarpalayam taluk, number of— 716–717

R

Radhakrishnan, Sri S.—
See Questions and Answers.

Raghava Madaliar, Sri E. L.—
Bills—Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 842–843
Demand for Grant *re* Electricity 213–214

Railway (s)—
Question *re*—
Nellore-Kanigiri line, construction of— 610
Salur-Bobbili line, restoration of— 357

Rajachidambaram, Sri P. B. K.—
Demand for Grant *re* Electricity 202–203
See Questions and Answers.

Rajagopalachari, the Hon. Sri C.—
Bills—Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 668, 683, 684
Demand for Grant *re*—Electricity 263–269
General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties 520–523
Harijan Uplift 129
Land Revenue 317–319
State Legislature 324, 342–347
Motion *re*—
Madras City Municipal Act, 1919, amendment to Schedule IV to the— 757, 758
Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939, notification under Section 3 (1) of the— 743, 744, 746, 750–752

PAGES

R—*cont.*

Rajagopalan, Sri N.—
See Questions and Answers.

Rajagopala Rao, Sri K.—
Bills—Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 .. 806–807
Demand for Grant *re* Jails 459–462
See Questions and Answers.

Rajampet division—
Question *re* Transfer of headquarters of— 243

Rajeswara Rao, Sri M.—
Demand for Grant *re*—
Co-operation 555, 556
Harijan Uplift 75–78
See Questions and Answers.

Raju, Sri D. K.—
Demand for Grant *re* Electricity 197–199

Rama, Sri T. K.—
Demand for Grant *re* Electricity 214–216

Ramabrahmam, Sri D.—
Demand for Grant *re* Forest 23–25

Ramachandra Rao, Sri P. S.—
Demand for Grant *re* General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties. 517, 518
See Questions and Answers.

Ramachandra Reddiar, Sri A.—
Demand for Grant *re* Co-operation 551–553

Ramakrishna Reddi, Sri B.—
Demand for Grant *re* Jails 444–447

Ramalingam, Sri S.—
Demand for Grant *re* Electricity 207–209
See Questions and Answers.

Ramamurthi, Sri P.—
Bills—
Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 625, 656, 659
Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 817–818
Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 822–829, 831
Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 770–773
Demand for Grant *re*—
Labour including Factories 417–424
Land Revenue 313–317, 322–323
State Legislature 336–337
Motion *re*—
Madras City Municipal Act, 1919, amendment to Schedule IV to the 755, 756
Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939, notification under section 3 (1) of the, approval of 742, 743, 745, 749

Rama Rao, Sri G.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 57–60
See Questions and Answers.

Rama Rao, Sri N. V.—
See Questions and Answers.

Rama Rao, Sri P.—
Demand for Grant *re* Co-operation 553–555

Rama Rao, Sri V.—
Demand for Grant *re* Electricity 217–220
See Questions and Answers.

PAGES

R—*cont.*

Ramasami, Sri C. Rajam—
Bills—Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 843, 844
See Questions and Answers.

Ramasami, Sri V. V.—
Demand for Grant *re*—
General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties 514
Harijan Uplift 52–55, 184

Ramasamy Kander, Sri N. C.—
Demand for Grant *re* Electricty 249

Ramasamy Naidu, Sri S.—
Demand for Grant *re* General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties 478–479, 522

Ramasamy Padayachi, Sri S. S.—
Bills—Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 676–677

Ramasamy Thevar, Sri A.—
Demand for Grant *re* Jails 456–457

Ramaswamy Mudaliar, Sri V. K.—
See Questions and Answers.

Ramesam, Sri K. V.—
Bills—Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 837, 838
Demand for Grant *re*—
Electricity 205–207
General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties 481–482
Division List, rectification of errors in — 193
See Questions and Answers.

Ramiah Chowdary, Sri K.—
See Questions and Answers.

Rami Reddi, Sri A.—
Demand for Grant *re* Electricity 220–221

Ranga Rao, Sri K.—
Demand for Grant *re* Labour including Factories 393–396

Ranga Reddi, the Hon. Sri N.—
Demand for Grant *re* Electricity 187–191, 256–263

Rangaswami Reddiar, Sri P.—
Demand for Grant *re* Jails 454–456
See Questions and Answers.

Rao, Sri C. V. K.—
Bills—
Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 655, 656
Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 802, 803
Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 768, 769, 770, 789

Rathina Gounder, Sri N.—
Demand for Grant *re* Electricity 216–217

Ratnaswami, Sri A. M.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 55–57

Rayalaseema Development Board—
Question *re* Nomination to — 508

Registration—
Demand for Grant *re* — 588

Rents—
See Estates.

Repealing and Amending Bill, 1952—
See Bills.

Resolution *re*—
Durgaprasada Veerabhadra Deo Bahadur, Sri V., Raja of Kuruppam death of — 697–699

PAGES

R—*cont.*

Revenue and Expenditure (Madras Government)—
Question *re*—
Districtwar particulars for 1946–52 14–15
— of West Godavari district 730

Roads—
Question *re* Koppam-Penganttiri road in Walluvanad taluk, construction of — 121

Road Transport Schemes—Working expenses—
Demand for Grant *re* — 590

Romperu Drainage Canal—
Question *re* Lands on the banks of — allotment of — 501

Rules Committee—
See Committee.

Rulings—
Divisions—A Member is bound by the vote he has actually given though he inadvertently goes into the wrong lobby 192

Rural Dispensaries—
See Dispensaries.

S

Sahajanandam, Sri A. S.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 60–63

Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939—
Motion *re* Notification by the Governor under section 3 (1) of the —. 738–752

Sales tax—
Question *re* Levy of — on fish in West Coast—information *re* — ... 364–365

Salur-Bobbili railway line—
Question *re* Restoration of — 357

Sambandam, Sri K. R.—
Demand for Grant *re* Land Revenue 304–306

Sambasivam, Sri A.—
Demand for Grant *re* Land Revenue 311–313

Sanjivayya, the Hon. Sri D.—
Demand for Grant *re* Co-operation 533–536, 560–562

Sankaranarayana Menon, Sri V.—
Demand for Grant *re* Co-operation 558
See Questions and Answers.

Sankara Reddi, the Hon. Sri N.—
Motion *re* Madras City Municipal Act, 1919, amendment to Schedule IV to the — 754, 755, 761, 762

Sankara Varma Raja, Sri E. K.—
Demand for Grant *re* Jails 453–454
See Questions and Answers.

Sannasi, Sri T. V.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 131–132

Santhappa, Sri K.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 151–153

Satyanarayana, Sri G.—
Demand for Grant *re* Jails 448–450
See Questions and Answers.

Sea water—
Question *re* Research on the use of —for agricultural purposes .. 707–708

Security—
Question *re* Demand of — from journals and presses 72

Seetharamiah, Sri D.—
Half-hour debate *re* starvation deaths in Chittoor and Anantapur districts, request for — 376
See Questions and answers.

Seethi, Janab K. M.—
Demand for Grant *re*—
Electricity 211–212
Forest 35–37
General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties 510, 511
See Questions and Answers

Selvaraj, Sri P.—
Demand for Grant *re* Jails 447–448

Senapathi Gounder, Sri A.—
Demand for Grant *re* Agriculture 587, 588

Shanmugham, Sri T.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 91, 169–170

Shenbagavalli Dam—
Question *re* Execution of — 111

Shop Assistants Act—
Question *re*—
Application of — to hospitals and dispensaries 500
Cost of implementing the 356

Siddanna Gowd, Sri R.—
Bills—Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 .. 801–802
Demand for Grant *re* — Forest 17–21

Sivakasi Municipal Electrical Undertaking—
See Papers laid on the table of the House.

Sivarami Reddi, Sri N.—
See Questions and Answers.

Somasundara Goundar, Sri S.—
Demand for Grant *re* Land Revenue 289–290

Somayajulu, Sri S. N.—
Bills—Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 644–648

Soundaram Ramachandran, Dr. T. S.—
Demand for Grant *re*—
Harijan Uplift 124–128
Jails 441–444

Speaker, Mr.—
Adjournment motion *re*—
Erasure of place-names in Hindi from the name boards in railway stations in Tamil Nad 736, 737
Hunger-strike by political prisoners in Cannanore Jail 123, 124
Announcement of the arrival of — in the House 225
Bills—
Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952 .. 850–851, 852
Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill, 1952 .. 853 854
Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 793–794, 813, 819–820
Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 822, 837, 845, 848, 849
Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 768, 790, 791
Business of the House, motion for transaction of official business on a non-official day 738
Business of the House, programme of — 854, 855
Condolence resolution *re* death of Sri V. Durgaprasad Veerabhadra Deo Bahadur, Raja of Kuruppam 697, 699
Division list, rectification of errors in 191–193

PAGES

S—*cont.*

Speaker, Mr.—*cont.*
Half-hour debate *re* Starvation deaths in Chittoor and Anantapur districts 376–377
Legislative Assembly Chamber, loud-speaker arrangements in the — 105
Motion *re* Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939, notification under section 3 (1) of the — approval of — 739, 740, 742, 744, 746, 747
See Rulings.

Sridharan, Sri K. T.—
Demand for Grant *re* Labour including Factories 392–393

Sri Krishna, Sri V.—
Bills—Madras Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 812, 813
Demand for Grant *re* Land Revenue 281–284
See Questions and Answers.

Srungaram, Sri V.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 144–145

Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952—
See Bills.

Stamps—
Demand for Grant *re*— 588
"Starvation deaths"—
See Famine.

State Aid to Industries Act—
Question *re* Loans granted under 735

State Legislature—
Demand for Grant *re* 324–349
Loud-speaker arrangements in the Assembly Chamber 105

Stationery and Printing—
Demand for Grant *re* — 590

Statistics—
Question *re* collection of — of fish catches 114–115

Subba Reddi, Sri K.—
Bills—Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 .. 813–815

Subba Reddi, Sri M.—
See Questions and Answers. 647

Subbiah, Sri A. K.—
Demand for Grant *re* Harijan Uplift 142–144

Subramania Gounder, Sri K. S.— 558, 559
Demand for Grant *re* Co-operation

Subramaniam, the Hon. Sri C.—
Bills—
Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 621–624, 684–693
Payment of Salaries and Removal of Disqualifications (Amendment) Bill, 1952. 763, 764
Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 764, 767–768, 776
Business of the House, programme of — 80–81
Business of the House transaction of official business on a non-official day. 738
Condolence resolution *re* death of Sri V. Durgaprasad Veerabhadra Deo Bahadur, Raja of Kuruppam 697
Demand for Grant *re* State Legislature 324, 347–349
Demands for Grants, change in the order of voting on — .. 377
Motion *re*—
Rules Committee, appointment of— 753, 754
Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939, notification under section 3 (1) of the — approval of — 745, 747

PAGES

S—*cont.*

Sugarcane Prices—
Question *re*—
Payment of, by factories in two instalments 11–13
Reduction in — Ryots' representation *re* — 114

Suryanarayana, Sri G.—
Demand for Grant *re* — Harijan Uplift 165–166

Suryanarayana Raju, Sri Raja Sagi—
Demand for Grant *re* — Agriculture 578–579

Swaminathan, Sri R. V.—
Bills—Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 669–671
Demand for Grant *re*—State Legislature 334–336
See Questions and Answers.

Swayamprakasam, Sri S.—
Demand for Grant *re*—Harijan Uplift 136–138
See Question and Answers.

Syamasundara Rao, Sri P.—
Demand for Grant *re*—Harijan Uplift 92–94

T

Takkavi Loans—
See "Loans".

Tamidapudi Tank—
Question *re* Construction of— 716

Teachers—
Question *re*—
Salary of, in aided schools, Revision of— 241–242
Travelling allowance paid to — on election work 488

Tenants—
Question *re* Eviction of — by landlords of Kumbakonam taluk .. 619

Thangavelu, Sri P.—
Demand for Grant *re* — Harijan Uplift 162–163

Thangavelu, Sri R.—
Demand for Grant *re* — Harijan Uplift 161

Thimma Reddi, Sri P.—
Bills—
Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 665–667
Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 773–777
Condolence resolution *re* death of—Sri V. Durgaprasad Veerabhadra Deo Bahadur, Raja of Kuruppam 598
Demand for Grant *re* — Harijan Uplift 170–172

Thinakarasamy Thevar, Sri S.—
Bills—Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 651–654

Thirumurthi, Sri P. K.—
Demand for Grant *re* — Harijan Uplift 159–160

Thumarada-Jamparakota Road—
Question *re* Construction of — 605

Trade dispute—
Question *re*—in Arubi's Cafe, Madras 231–232

Travelling allowance—
Question *re*—
For Chief Minister's tour in Coimbatore district 505
For Finance Minister's tour in Aruppukkottai 365
For teachers for doing election work 488
For village officers for attending taluk headquarters 236–237

Tuberculosis Hospital—
Question *re* Construction of a—for Pudukkottai 507

PAGES

V

Vagheesam Pillai, Sri G.—
Demand for Grant *re*—Agriculture 582–583

Vaikuntam, Sri A.—
Demand for Grant *re*—Harijan Uplift 168–169

Vanamadevi and Thiruvendipuram Dams—
Question *re* Silt clearance of— 605–606

Varadarajulu Naidu, Dr. P.—
Demand for Grant *re*—Harijan Uplift 172–173

Veerabhadram, Sri M.—
Demand for Grant *re*—Labour including Factories 407–408
See Questions and Answers.

Veloo, Sri A.—
Demand for Grant *re*—Harijan Uplift 160–161

Velukkan, Sri C.—
Demand for Grant *re*—Harijan Uplift 65

Vema Reddi, Sri K. V.—
See Questions and Answers.

Vemiah, Sri S.—
Demand for Grant *re*—
Co-operation 556, 557
Harijan Uplift 63–65

Venkaiah, Sri K.—
Demand for Grant *re*—Agriculture 587

Venkata Jagga Rao, Sri R.—
See Questions and Answers.

Venkatakurmi Naidu, Sri K.—
Demand for Grant *re*—Agriculture 584–586

Venkatanarayana Dora, Sri K.—
Demand for Grant *re*—
Forest 27–28
Land Revenue 299–301
See Questions and Answers.

Venkatarama Ayyar, Sri S.—
Demand for Grant *re* — Land Revenue 290–292
See Questions and Answers.

Venkataramana Gowda, Sri K.—
Demand for Grant *re*—
Forest 25–27
Land Revenue 278–279

Venkatasubba Reddi, Sri M.—
Demand for Grant *re*—Forest 41–42

Venkatasubba Reddi, Sri T. N.—
Bills—Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 .. 803

Venkatasubbayya, Sri P.—
See Questions and Answers.

Venkataswami Reddi, Sri P.—
Demand for Grant *re* — Forest 37–38

Venkatesa Sholagar, Sri P.—
Demand for Grant *re*—Agriculture 586–587
See Questions and Answers.

Venkateswara Paper and Straw Board Mills, Tirupati, Sri—
See Loans.

Venkateswarlu, Sri Pillalamarri—
Bills—
Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 659–663
Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 782–783

PAGES

V—*cont.*

Demand for Grant *re*—State Legislature 324–328

See Questions and Answers. 349

Veterinary—
Demand for Grant *re*— 589

Veterinary College—
Question *re* Number of students admitted to the Degree Course during 1948–52 108–110

Veterinary Hospitals—
See "Hosptials."

Vigilance Committees—
Question *re* Constitution and functions of— 506

Village Courts—
See Panchayat Boards.

Village Officers—
Question *re* Travelling allowance for attending taluk headquarters. 236–237

Vinayakam, Sri K.—
Bills—
Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 641–644, 667, 668
Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952 .. 851–852
Demand for Grant *re*—
General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties 471–474, 529, 533
Harijan Uplift 128–130
Motion *re*—Madras City Municipal Act, 1919, amendment to Schedule IV to the — 756–758, 762

Virupakshayya, Sri S. C.—
Bills—Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 846–847
Demand for Grant *re*—Forest 21–22

Viswanatham, Sri T.—
Adjournment motion *re* — Hunger-strike by political prisoners in Cannanore Jail 124
Bills—
Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1952 678–683
Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952 .. 851
Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill, 1952.. .. 853
Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 817
Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 847
Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 785–786
Business of the House, programme of — 80, 854–855
Business of the House, transaction of official business on a non-official day 738
Condolence resolution *re* death of Sri V. Durgaprasad Veerabhadra Deo Bahadur, Raja of Kuruppam 697–698
Demand for Grant *re*—
Electricity 258–259, 268
Forest 44, 46, 47
General Sales Tax and Other Taxes and Duties 519–525, 526, 527
Harijan Uplift 173–178, 186–187
State Legislature 337–343
Division List, rectification of errors in — 192–193

V—*cont.*

Viswanatham, Sri T.—
Motion *re*—
Madras City Municipal Act, 1919, amendment to Schedule IV to the — 759–761
Sales of Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1939, notification under section 3 (1) of the — 739–740
741, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 750, 751, 752
Speaker, Mr., announcement of arrival of — 225
See Questions and Answers.

Viswanathan, Sri K. R.—
Demand for Grant *re*—Forest 30–31
See Questions and Answers.

Votes—
Rectification of errors in the counting of — 191–193

W

Wages—
Question *re* Minimum — for municipal employees, fixation of — .. 353–355

Well Subsidy Scheme—
Question *re*—
Amount spent on — 357–359
Subsidies granted to Harijans under the — 731

Y

Yarn—
Question *re* allotment of—to handloom factories in Malabar .. 244

Yellamanda Raddi, Sri G.—
Bills—Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 .. 810–811

Z

Zamindaris—
See Estates.

தமிழ்நாடு சட்டமன்றப் பேரவை
TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS